REPORT RESUMES

ED 019 337
UD 005 154

EXPANSION OF THE FREE CHOICE OPEN ENROLLMENT PROGRAM.

BY- FOX, DAVID J.
CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION, NEW YORK, N.Y.

PUB DATE SEP 67
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$4.44 109P.

DESCRIPTORS- *FREE CHOICE TRANSFER PROGRAMS, *ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS, *JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS, *PROGRAM EVALUATION, OPEN ENROLLMENT, TEACHER EVALUATION, STUDENT EVALUATION, SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT, PRINCIPALS, READING ACHIEVEMENT, BUS TRANSPORTATION, EVALUATION METHODS, RATING SCALES, QUESTION ANSWER INTERVIEWS, OBSERVATION, TEACHER ATTITUDES, STUDENT ATTITUDES, NEW YORK CITY, ESEA TITLE 1

THIS EVALUATION OF THE SECOND YEAR OF THE FREE CHOICE OPEN ENROLLMENT PROGRAM (OE) IN NEW YORK CITY'S PUBLIC SCHOOLS PRESENTS COMPARATIVE DATA FOR 26 RECEIVING AND 15 SENDING ELEMENTARY AND JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS. THE AREAS STUDIED WERE (1) CHILDRENS' CLASSROOM FUNCTIONING, (2) TEACHERS' CLASSROOM FUNCTIONING, (3) SCHOOL APPEARANCE, CLIMATE, AND FUNCTIONING, AND (4) ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS OF PRINCIPALS TOWARD THE PROGRAM. DATA ARE BASED ON OBSERVATIONS, FOUR SPECIALLY DEVISED INSTRUMENTS, AND INTERVIEWS WITH PRINCIPALS. ON THE ELEMENTARY LEVEL, FINDINGS SHOW THAT NO TEACHER IN A RECEIVING SCHOOL WAS EVER RATED NEGATIVELY ON ATTITUDES, WHEREAS IN SENDING SCHOOLS 14 PERCENT RECEIVED THIS RATING. OE CHILDREN CONSISTENTLY SHOWED MORE EFFECTIVE FUNCTIONING IN AREAS OF VOLUNTEERING, PARTICIPATION, AND VERBAL FLUENCY. BUT THERE WAS NO EVIDENCE OF LONG-TERM IMPROVEMENT IN READING ACHIEVEMENT, ALTHOUGH OE CHILDREN DID BETTER THAN THE AVERAGE SENDING SCHOOL CHILD. AT THE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL LEVEL, THE RECEIVING SCHOOLS WERE AVERAGE OR ABOVE ON ALL THE EDUCATIONAL VARIABLES STUDIED. ALL THE GAINS SHOWN BY OE CHILDREN WERE ACHIEVED WITH NO LOSSES BY CHILDREN IN THE RECEIVING SCHOOLS. (NH)

ED019337

UD005151

Center for Urban Education
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

EXPANSION OF THE FREE CHOICE OPEN ENROLLMENT PROGRAM

David J. Fox

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10), performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1966-67 school year.

Committee on Field Research and Evaluation
Joseph Krevisky, Assistant Director

September 1967

TABLE OF CONTENTS

page

I Introduction and Procedure 1

II Teacher Functioning 13

III Children's Functioning 23

IV Overall School Appraisal 36

V Elementary School Principals' Perceptions of and Attitudes about the Open Enrollment Program 48

VI Conclusions 58

Appendix A: Tables A1

Appendix B: Instruments B1

Appendix C: Staff List C1

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURE

This is the report of the 1966-67 evaluation of the Free Choice Open Enrollment Program conducted in the New York City Public Schools. The Free Choice Open Enrollment program was designed to promote quality integrated education in the schools. Pupils residing in economically disadvantaged areas who were attending schools with a heavy concentration of minority groups were encouraged to transfer to schools with unused space where a more varied ethnic distribution existed. Summarized procedurally, this meant that children who entered the program were transported by bus to a receiving school which they attended rather than the sending school in their home neighborhood.

The Free Choice Open Enrollment program (hereafter referred to as OE) was evaluated at the end of the 1965-66 academic year in a multifaceted evaluation which covered: inclass observations in the receiving schools, both resident and OE children's perceptions of self, school; teacher and each other, obtained both through paper and pencil instruments and interviews with children; a sociometric analysis of friendship patterns within classes; analysis of school history as reflected on the cumulative record cards; analysis of progress in reading for OE children in general and an analysis of comparative progress for a sample of OE and sending school children matched on age, sex, and reading grade at the time the OE child entered the program; face-to-face interviews with principals, teachers and supplementary staff in the receiving schools.

This study was conducted in 38 receiving schools and included all receiving schools which enrolled at least 30 OE children, as well as a sample of those which enrolled fewer children. Also included were 25 sending schools, in which time permitted only duplication of three parts of the study conducted in the receiving schools: the administration of paper and pencil instruments to obtain childrens' perception of class and school, the analysis of record cards, and the analysis of reading progress.

Four major factors were considered in the final development of the plan for the 1966-67 evaluation. First, no changes had been made in the administration or functioning of the OE program in 1966-67 as compared to 1965-66. Second, it was recognized that the possibilities for expansion of the program were severely limited in view of the diminishing availability of space in schools which met the double criteria for a receiving school: having unused space, and having an ethnic distribution which would promote integrated education. Third, it was felt that since in the 1965-66 evaluation all data had been collected in May-June 1966, these data offered a reasonable basis for knowing what 1966-67 would be like as well, for those aspects studied. Finally, considerable parental opposition had been expressed in receiving schools to the face-to-face interviews with children, as a procedure, and in the asking of questions about friendship patterns in any way.

These four factors led to the decision to plan the 1966-67 evaluation of the OE program as a limited follow-up to the 1965-66 study, which would concentrate upon obtaining two kinds of data not obtained in the original study: data based on the in-class observation of lessons in the sending schools, and the perceptions of sending school principals about the OE program. To provide comparable current data for receiving schools, the 1965-66 study was partially replicated in that observers were again sent into classes in the receiving schools and again interviewed the principals of the receiving schools.

Thus, this 1966-67 evaluation will present comparative data for receiving and sending schools at the elementary and junior high level in four areas: childrens' in-class functioning; teachers' in-class functioning; overall appraisal of school appearance, climate and functioning; and principals' perceptions of, and attitudes about, the program.

Scope of the Evaluation

The current evaluation involved a total of 41 schools: 15 sending schools (11 elementary, and 4 junior high) and 26 receiving schools, (22 elementary and 4 junior high). The number of schools and classes seen is presented in Table 1, by grade and school level, and type of school (receiving and sending).

The receiving schools in this 1966-67 evaluation were selected from those studied the previous year. To select the 22 elementary schools studied again, we first determined which of the 38 elementary receiving schools in the previous study still had at least 30 OE children enrolled.

Table 1

Number of Schools and Classes Seen, By Grade, School Level and Type of School

School Level and Type	Number of Schools	Grade									Total Across Grade
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
Elementary-Sending	11	4	3	28	21	27	16				99
Receiving	22			46	57	46	49				198
Junior High-Sending	4						5	12	10	7	34
Receiving	4							12	13	11	36

All 27 such schools still had that number of children, and so these schools were ranked by overall level of reading achievement as of May 1966, and a sample of 22 was selected to represent all levels of achievement. The 11 sending schools were randomly selected from those which sent children to the 22 receiving schools selected. The four sending and receiving junior high schools were randomly selected from among those to which children in the already selected elementary schools were graduated, after the schools had been grouped by borough with each borough having schools at all reading levels.

In terms of geographic distribution, of the 22 receiving schools, 2 were located in the Bronx, 4 in Manhattan, 5 in Brooklyn and 11 in Queens.[1] Of the 11 sending schools, 2 each were in the Bronx and Manhattan, 3 in Brooklyn and 4 in Queens. Since the selection of junior high schools had been stratified by borough, one sending and one receiving school was located in each of the boroughs of the Bronx, Manhattan, Brooklyn and Queens.

Once a school was selected, the Principal was asked to send in a school organization sheet indicating the number of OE children in each class. Using this, project staff selected six classes to be observed, keeping in mind the desire to see different grades as well as classes with different proportions of OE children. The principal was then notified which classes we had selected, and was asked to select an additional three classes which he felt we should see to obtain a balanced picture of the school. Principals were free to use whatever criteria they wished in selecting these additional classes.

---

[1] Schools in Richmond do not participate in the OE program.

Instruments

Four instruments were used in this evaluation:

1. The Individual Lesson Observation Report (hereafter referred to as the ILOR). This instrument was the basic device for obtaining the observers' perceptions of the lessons observed. The ILOR consists of two sections, one providing the details of the lesson observed and the other containing rating scales covering specific aspects of the lesson. In the first section, the observer was asked to indicate the subject area of the lesson, who taught the lesson, the length of the observation and whether or not the observer saw the entire lesson. Finally, the observer was asked to indicate his perception as to whether or not he perceived this lesson as "typical of normal functioning in this classroom." Throughout the study, at least 90 per cent and usually more of the lessons were rated as being "completely typical" or a "reasonable approximation" of what was felt usually took place in the classroom. At each visit, then, a small proportion of the lessons were rated as "less than a reasonable approximation" of normal functioning in the classroom. Most often these ratings involved some special activity or a nonteaching activity. In only isolated instances did it reflect the observer's judgment that he was watching a lesson particularly developed for his benefit.

The second section of the ILOR was developed to cover three areas of classroom functioning involving the teacher, and a fourth area involving the children. The three areas involving teacher functioning were: 1) Planning, Organization and the Use of Aids (2 items); 2) Provision for Continuity and Independent Work (4 items); and 3) Creativity and Quality of Communication and Instruction (5 items). The fourth area consisted of seven items on children's functioning.

The basic (rating) scale used was a five-point rating centered around a midpoint considered "average." Above this midpoint were two ratings, typically one labeled "above average" and an extreme positive rating labeled "outstanding." Below the average midpoint were two parallel negative ratings, one labeled "below average" or "poor" and the negative extreme, usually labeled "extremely poor." More important than the labels, during the briefing of the observers the scale was explained, and it was made clear that it was to be seen as a five-point scale ranging from atypically good to atypically bad, about the average midpoint.

No attempt is made on the ILOR to delineate or describe for the observer what each of the rating scale points means in terms of actual classroom behavior. Nor was any effort made to do this during the briefing. This means that each observer brought to the observation his own perception of quality functioning in each area. The value of these data then rests on the reliability of such judgments by independent observers. Estimates of this reliability are available from the use of the ILOR in the 1966-67 evaluation of the Free Choice Open Enrollment program. Here estimates of its reliability were provided by having two observers see and rate the same class, and computing the per cent of time they assigned ratings which were identical or within one scale point. For different aspects of the ILOR these estimates were 90.6 per cent and 96.4 per cent. Moreover, almost all of the discrepancies of the one scale point involved differences of degree within the same quality, i.e., a difference between a rating of one representing "outstanding" and a rating of two representing "above average."

Thus, these data suggest that the ILOR produces reliable ratings of the phenomena being observed, despite the lack of any definitions of gradations of quality.

2. The Teacher Behavior Record. The observers rated teacher attitude and inclass behavior using the Teacher Behavior Record (TBR), an instrument developed by Ryans.[2] This instrument asks the observer to rate the teacher on 19 different attitudinal or behavioral characteristics. For each characteristic opposite behaviors are described both through single adjectives (i.e., unsympathetic, understanding) and through a brief explanation of each extreme. The observer is offered a seven-point rating scale for each characteristic.

---

[2] Ryans, D.G. Characteristics of Teachers, Washington, D.C. (American Council on Education, 1960, p. 414).

Reliability and Validity of the TBR

In his book, Ryans reports varied estimates of reliability for the scale.[3] For the 19 separate subscales, he reports reliabilities ranging from .60 to .96, and for the composite scale he reports reliability estimates ranging from .64 to .70.

For the use to which we put the TBR, reliability can also be estimated from the 1965-66 study of the Free Choice Open Enrollment program in which we used it based on pairs of independent ratings. In the Open Enrollment study, for ratings of 21 teachers, the ratings were identical or one scale point apart 76.4 per cent of the time, and 2 scale points apart 18.3 per cent of the time. Thus, they differed more than two points only 5.3 per cent of the time.

3. The General School Report. At the completion of the school visit, each observer independently completed a second instrument, the General School Report (GSR). This instrument asked the observer to rate aspects of school climate and the attitudes of administrative staff and teaching faculty. In addition, they were asked to rate the overall physical attractiveness of the building and the classrooms and to indicate their overall appraisal of the school, if the classes they had seen were typical.

The reliability of the GSR can be directly estimated since in each school, the two observers completed it independently. Reliability was estimated for the items on climate and attitude and overall appraisal.

---

[3] Ibid, pp. 107-121.

The pairs of ratings were identical or within one scale point of each other 91 per cent of the time. Equally important, only rarely did a discrepancy reflect the observers giving different qualitative evaluations, i.e., one saying positive and the other negative.

4. The Principal's Interview Guide. Observers were given a highly structured guide for the interview with the principals. While they were free to ask additional questions required to make any specific response clear, the basic questions to be asked, and the order in which they were asked, was standard in all interviews. One observer served as interviewer, while the other served as recorder. After the interview, they both went over the responses recorded to be certain that no individual interpretation by the recorder had gone unnoticed.

Observer Selection and Briefing

Twenty-three observers from three different kinds of background and experience were used in this evaluation. Sixteen of the observers were faculty of local colleges and universities, all members of departments of schools of education. Of these faculty members, nine were educators by background and experience, and sever were social scientists. The third type of observer used were seven Directors of independent (private) schools in the New York area. All observers used had had prior first-hand contact with urban schools.

All observers used in this evaluation attended a briefing session at which the purposes of the project and their role in it were explained. The instruments were reviewed and discussed in detail. Since most of the observers had had previous experience with the instruments in the evaluation of the More Effective Schools program, briefing was simpler than it might otherwise have been.

Design of the Study

The basic plan for the school visit was to send a team of two observers to a school for a full day's visit. During this visit, each observer observed and evaluated four classes separately with a ninth class seen jointly, but evaluated independently. Approximately forty minutes were alloted for each classroom observation with the time between visits used for filling in the class lesson rating forms.

Lunchtime was spent eating with the children, whenever possible, and noting the physical facilities and prevailing atmosphere in the varied lunchrooms. The remaining time was devoted to a joint interview by the observers with the principal. Finally, at the end of the visit, a general school appraisal was filled in and comments added to the form after the visit.

Whenever possible, the same team of observers who visited a receiving school also visited a sending school.

The junior high school visits were conducted in the same fashion except that there were no principal interviews and so additional time was given over to observations of lessons.

Data Analysis and Presentation

Basically the data were hand tallied, and classified by grade.

Initial inspection of the data showed no consistent differences by grade. Further analysis showed no differences between classes selected by project staff and by principal, and so in this report data will be reported for all observers and all grades in school combined. Chi square was used to test the statistical significance of observed differences in distributions of ratings between sending and receiving schools. The .05 level of significance was used throughout the evaluation.

In Chapter II, we report the data on teacher functioning, consisting of the ratings obtained from the ILOR on teacher behavior and from the TBR on teacher attitude. In Chapter III, we report the data on childrens' functioning obtained from the observers' ratings on the ILOR and, for OE children in elementary schools, data on reading achievement. Then in Chapter IV we report the data on overall school appraisal obtained from the observers' ratings on the GSR. Chapter V presents the data obtained from the interviews with the principals. Finally, in Chapter VI, we present the overall conclusions.

Chapter II

TEACHER FUNCTIONING

The ILOR contained 11 specific items concerned with teacher functioning. At the elementary school level, there were no statistically significant differences for any of these eleven aspects between lessons observed in receiving and sending schools. In contrast, there were statistically significant differences at the junior high school level for 6 of the 11 aspects.

The typical elementary school lesson in either sending or receiving schools was rated as "above average" in quality of instruction, and "average" in both the amount of, and depth of the material covered. It was considered to be "well organized and planned" and as displaying an "average" amount of creativity and imagination but reflecting "little or no" use of teaching aids. The teachers' verbal communication with the children was considered "above average." Finally, the observers believed they saw "some" efforts to relate the material to the child's own experience and to earlier material as well as "some" effort to develop a foundation for both independent work and future lessons.

At the junior high school level, the above description holds with equal force for the lessons seen in the receiving schools. The only differences were that the amount of material covered and the depth of the lesson were rated as "above average" rather than average. However, as was noted above, the sending school lessons had less positive ratings for six aspects: quality of instruction, depth and amount of material covered, teacher's verbal communication with the children, planning and organization, and the extent to which the lesson established a basis for future lessons.

In summary, the observers saw no evidence of differential teacher functioning in sending and receiving elementary schools, but did see what they considered better teacher functioning in the receiving, as compared to the sending, junior high schools.

In the tables that follow, each aspect is considered separately, and the relevant data presented. For the reader's convenience, these data will be presented in a double column format. In the left hand column, the aspect being considered will be identified and results of the comparison of the distributions for sending and receiving schools, through the chi square procedure; and a summary of the descriptive data will be presented. In the right column, we present a table with the complete distributions.

Specific Aspects of Teacher Functioning

Aspect of Evaluation and Comparison

---

(1) Quality of Instruction (ILOR):

On the elementary level there was no difference between sending and receiving schools: about 45 per cent of both sending and receiving school lessons were rated "outstanding" or "above average."

On the junior high level there was a statistically significant difference: a quarter of the junior high school sending lessons were rated as "outstanding" or "above average" compared to half of the receiving school ratings. A "below average" or "poor" rating was given to 8 per cent of the receiving schools' lessons, whereas more than a third of the sending schools' lessons were so judged.

	Per Cents			
	Elementary		J. H. S.	
Scale Ratings	S*	R*	S*	R*
Outstanding	8	14	3	17
Above average	37	28	23	35
Average	27	33	38	40
Below average	17	18	18	8
Poor	11	7	18	0

---

(2) Depth of Lesson (ILOR):

On the elementary level there was no difference between the sending and receiving schools; about 40 per cent of the lessons were rated "average" in depth; about a third were rated "above average" or "outstanding"; and about a quarter were rated "below average" and/or "poor."

On the junior high school level there was a statistically significant difference: over one-half of the receiving school lessons were rated of "above average" or "outstanding" depth whereas only about 20 per cent of the sending schools' lessons received this rating. In about 30 per cent of the lessons in the sending schools and 10 per cent in the receiving schools, the rating was "below average" or "poor" in depth.

	Per Cents			
	Elementary		J. H. S.	
Scale Ratings	S*	R*	S*	R*
Outstanding	6	8	3	8
Above average	25	23	15	45
Average	38	46	53	37
Below average	20	18	9	10
Poor	11	5	20	0

---

*S - Sending Schools
R - Receiving Schools

Aspect of Evaluation and Comparison

---

(3) Amount of Material Covered (ILOR):

On the elementary level there was no difference between the sending and receiving schools: almost one-half of the ratings were "average" in both the sending and the receiving schools.

In the junior high schools there was a statistically significant difference: one-half of the lessons on the receiving schools were rated as "outstanding" or "above average" while slightly less than 20 per cent in the sending schools received these ratings.

	Per Cents			
	Elementary		J. H. S.	
Scale Ratings	S*	R*	S*	R*
Outstanding	5	11	3	10
Above average	26	25	15	40
Average	43	48	56	45
Below average	20	13	9	5
Poor	6	3	17	0

---

(4) Amount of Planning and Organization Evident in Lesson (ILOR):

On the elementary level, there was no difference between the sending and receiving schools. Approximately half of the lessons in both sets of schools were rated as "exceptionally" or "well" organized.

On the J.H.S. level there was a statistically significant difference: more than one-third of the receiving schools' lessons were rated as "exceptionally" organized as compared with only 3 per cent of the lessons in the sending schools.

	Per Cents			
	Elementary		J. H. S.	
Scale Ratings	S*	R*	S*	R*
Exceptionally organized	12	9	3	36
Well organized	44	39	56	43
Some organization	40	41	32	18
No organization	4	11	9	3

---

*S - Sending Schools
R - Receiving Schools

Aspect of Evaluation and Comparison

(5) Level of Creativity and Imagination (ILOR):

On both the JH and elementary levels there was no statistically significant difference between the sending and receiving schools. In both sending and receiving elementary schools about a third of the lessons were rated "average," while about 40 per cent were rated "somewhat" or "very stereotyped."

On the JH level, approximately 15 per cent of all lessons were rated "extremely" or "moderately" creative.

	Per Cents			
	Elementary		J. H. S.	
Scale Ratings	S*	R*	S*	R*
Extremely creative	8	7	3	8
Moderately creative	24	18	12	8
Average	29	38	46	56
Somewhat stereotyped	18	20	21	17
Very stereotyped	21	17	18	11

(6) Extent and Effectiveness of Teacher Aids (ILOR):

On both the elementary and JH levels there was no difference between sending and receiving schools in the extent and effectiveness of teacher aids. On the elementary level, the majority of ratings in both sending and receiving schools indicated "little or no use" of teacher aids. Only 4 per cent of the lessons were rated as "effective", wide use of aids.

On the JH level, too, the majority of all ratings indicated "little or no use" of teacher aids, and only a small percentage were rated as "wide use, effective."

	Per Cents			
	Elementary		J. H. S.	
Scale Ratings	S*	R*	S*	R*
Wide use, effective	4	4	6	3
Some use, effective	31	24	24	17
Used, not effectively	16	13	9	23
Little or no use	49	59	61	57

(7) Extent of Reference to Earlier Material (ILOR):

On both the elementary and JH levels, there was no difference between sending and receiving schools, and for both levels the distribution of ratings was similar.

Between 20 and 30 per cent of the lessons in both sending and receiving schools made "considerable" reference to earlier material, while about half of the lessons in both types of schools tended to be rated "some."

	Per Cents			
	Elementary		J. H. S.	
Scale Ratings	S*	R*	S*	R*
Considerable	31	21	24	26
Some	43	57	53	64
None	26	22	23	10

---

*S - Sending Schools
R - Receiving Schools

Aspect of Evaluation and Comparison

(8) Opportunities for Child To Relate Lesson To Background or Experience (ILOR):

There was no difference between the sending and receiving schools for either the elementary or J.H. level.

On the elementary level approximately half the lessons in both sets of schools presented "some" opportunity for the child to relate the lesson to his background or experience, while the other half of the ratings were divided between "consistent" and "no" opportunity.

On the JH level, less than 20 per cent of the lessons provided "consistent opportunities" to pupils

	Per Cents			
	Elementary		J. H. S.	
Scale Ratings	S*	R*	S*	R*
Consistent opportunities	21	27	12	16
Some opportunities	52	47	47	59
No opportunities	27	26	41	25

(9) Extent of Foundation for Future Lessons (ILOR):

On the elementary level there was no statistical difference between the sending and receiving schools. In both sets of schools 60 per cent of the lessons laid "some foundation" for future lessons, while about 10 per cent laid "little" or "no" foundation.

On the JH level there was a statistically significant difference between the sending and receiving schools: the ratings indicate that the receiving school lessons had more possibilities for continuity, almost twice as large a percentage of receiving school lessons were judged to have laid "considerable foundation for future lessons."

	Per Cents			
	Elementary		J. H. S.	
Scale Ratings	S*	R*	S*	R*
Considerable foundation	28	30	24	46
Some foundation	60	60	70	54
Little or No foundation	12	10	6	0

---

*
S- Sending Schools
R- Receiving Schools

(10) Extent of Foundation For Independent Work (ILOR):

There was no difference between the sending and receiving schools on either the elementary or JHS levels.

Half of the ratings for both sets of elementary school lessons indicated that there was "some" foundation for independent work. Twenty-five per cent of all the lessons had "considerable foundations laid for independent work.

At the JHS level more than 60 per cent of the lessons in both sets of schools were rated as having "some" foundation for independent work, and less than 15 per cent of the lessons were judged as having "considerable" foundation laid.

	Per Cents			
	Elementary		J. H. S.	
Scale Ratings	S*	R*	S*	R*
Considerable	25	25	13	9
Some	49	53	63	62
None	26	22	24	29

(11) Teacher's Verbal Communication With The Children (ILOR):

On the elementary level there was no difference between the sending and receiving schools; only 10 per cent of the ratings judged the teacher's verbal communication with the children "below average" or "poor."

On the J.H. level there was a statistically significant difference: the receiving schools were rated above average more frequently than the sending schools. Sixty sever per cent of the lessons of the J.H. receiving schools' lessons were rated as "excellent" and "above average" as compared with 26 per cent of the sending schools' lessons.

	Per Cents			
	Elementary		J. H. S.	
Scale Ratings	S*	R*	S*	R*
Excellent	22	20	6	15
Above average	34	31	20	52
Average	34	39	65	30
Below average	7	8	9	3
Poor	3	2	0	0

---

* S - Sending Schools
R - Receiving Schools

Teacher Attitude

Teacher attitude was evaluated through the Ryans Teacher Behavior Record (TBR). Table 2 presents the data from this instrument. As can be seen in that Table, the TBR provides ratings of teacher attitude and appearance in terms of 19 characteristics. For convenience, the seven-point scale used by the observers has been compressed into the three-point scale reported in Table 2.

A glance at the first two columns indicates that at the elementary level the differences in the proportion of positive ratings were small: they were never more than 8 per cent and 5 per cent or less for 16 of of the 19 characteristics rated. Thus on this aspect of teacher functioning, like those just discussed, the observers saw no differences between teachers' inclass behavior, in the sending and receiving elementary schools.

The data in those first two columns also indicate that the observers had a consistently positive view of teacher attitude and behavior. Only the proportion of ratings indicating original rather than stereotyped teaching dropped below 50 per cent and for more than half of the characteristics rated, the proportion of positive ratings was at least two-thirds.

At the junior high school level the findings were completely different than at the elementary level. Scanning the proportion of positive responses (columns 7 and 8), the difference in observer perception of

Table 2

Response Pattern For Teacher Behavior Record, by Characteristic, School Level, and Type of School

Characteristic	Elementary Level: Proportion of Ratings:						Junior High Level: Proportion of Ratings:					
	Positive		Balanced		Negative		Positive		Balanced		Negative	
	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R
1. Attractive - Unattractive	78	76	16	22	6	2	62	90	31	10	7	0
2. Integrated - Immature	78	75	18	22	4	3	57	87	38	8	7	5
3. Responsible - Evading	77	78	17	14	6	8	68	95	7	5	25	0
4. Fair-Partial	76	77	15	16	9	7	57	92	18	3	25	5
5. Confident - Uncertain	76	82	14	10	10	8	57	92	32	3	11	5
6. Calm-Excitable	76	73	12	20	12	7	61	87	25	8	14	5
7. Systematic - Disorganized	76	71	13	18	11	11	57	85	18	7	25	8
8. Steady-Erratic	75	83	17	13	8	4	61	95	25	0	11	5
9. Kindly-Harsh	68	67	17	18	15	15	57	72	14	15	29	13
10. Fluent - Inarticulate	67	70	19	20	14	10	54	77	25	13	21	10
11. Understanding-Unsympathetic	66	64	18	21	16	14	50	72	25	20	25	8
12. Responsive - Aloof	64	64	14	15	22	21	46	77	29	10	25	13
13. Alert-Apathetic	64	69	16	17	20	13	46	82	33	15	21	3
14. Optimistic - Pessimistic	63	66	22	18	15	16	46	92	33	8	21	0
15. Broad-Narrow	61	64	25	25	14	11	61	87	25	8	14	5
16. Democratic - Autocratic	54	53	21	24	25	23	50	74	21	16	29	10
17. Stimulating - Dull	54	58	13	19	33	23	44	69	23	18	33	13
18. Adaptable - Inflexible	50	56	21	21	29	23	36	67	43	23	21	10
19. Original - Stereotyped	36	39	28	32	36	28	32	40	29	35	39	25

the teachers in sending and receiving schools are apparent. Where at the elementary level, the differences never exceeded 8 per cent, at the junior high school level they were never less than 8 per cent, exceeded 20 per cent for 17 of the 19 characteristics, and exceeded 30 per cent for eight. In every instance, the higher proportion of positive ratings was obtained by the receiving school teachers. Clearly, then, the observers saw completely different teacher functioning at the junior high school level.

Yet it is important to note that these clear and large differences were mostly differences of degree rather than quality. For half, or close to half (at least 46 per cent) of the ratings were positive in the sending school junior high schools for 16 of the 19 characteristics. What happened then, was that on most characteristics the teachers in the sending schools were rated as either positive or balanced, whereas a large majority of teachers in the receiving schools were rated positively.

Chapter III

CHILDREN'S FUNCTIONING

On the ILOR there were six items concerned with the effectiveness of children's functioning in class. There was one other item on children drawn from the Teacher Behavior Record. In the elementary schools, one of these, a rating of the quality of the interrelationships among the children, was obtained as a single rating for the total class in both sending and receiving schools, and the ratings were more positive in the receiving schools. For the other six, only overall class ratings were obtained in the sending schools. However, in the receiving schools, in addition to this overall rating, separate ratings were obtained for OE and resident children. There were no statistically significant differences for any of the seven characteristics studied between the ratings of the functioning of OE and resident children; therefore the overall ratings will be reported in this chapter. Comparing OE and sending school children there were differences for three of the six characteristics: Larger proportions of OE than of sending school children: (1) participated in the lesson, (2) volunteered when teachers asked a question, and (3) their verbal fluency was more likely to be rated as "average" or "above."

Other than these differences the children's functioning was rated at the same levels and so the description that follows applies to all: the children's interest and enthusiasm was rated above average, and all or almost all participated[1] in the lesson. Their behavior was rated as above average and although more than half volunteered an answer when the teacher asked a question,[2] few or none asked spontaneous questions of their own volition. Communication among the children was considered average or above as was their verbal fluency.[3]

At the junior high school level, separate ratings were not feasible in the receiving schools since the extent of integration among resident children typically made it impossible for the observers to identify with certainty the OE children in a class. Thus ratings at this level for children's functioning are available for the total class only. At this level, differences were noted for every one of the aspects studied, and in every difference the ratings were more positive for the functioning of children in the lessons observed in the receiving schools.

Thus the typical sending school lesson in the junior high school involved less than half the class, with few children responding when the teacher asked a question and almost no spontaneous questions. The children behaved well and were considered to have exhibited average interest and enthusiasm, to have engaged in communication of average or below-average effectiveness and with average interrelationships, but below-average verbal fluency.

In contrast, in the receiving junior high school, the typical lesson involved more than half the class with half or more responding to the teacher's questions, although there were few spontaneous questions. The children behaved extremely well, and although their verbal fluency and communication were considered average, their interest and enthusiasm and interrelationships were considered above average.

---

[1] In the sending schools,the modal rating indicated that "more than half" participated.

[2] In the sending schools, the modal rating indicated that "half" volunteered.

[3] In the sending schools, verbal fluency was rated as "average."

Below, each of the seven aspects is considered specifically. As was done with teacher functioning, the aspects will be presented in a double-column format, with the comparison of sending and receiving schools and the descriptive data.

CHILDREN'S FUNCTIONING

Aspect of Evaluation and Comparison

(1) Extent of Children's Interest and Enthusiasm (ILOR):

At the elementary level there was no statistically significant difference between the receiving and sending schools. Approximately half of the lessons seen were rated as "outstanding" or "better than average" in the children's interest and enthusiasm, and about one-third rated as "average."

However, at the JHS level there was a statistically significant difference: in the receiving schools 94 per cent of the ratings indicated that the extent of children's interest and enthusiasm ranged from "average" to "outstanding" as compared with only 56 per cent of such ratings in the sending schools.

	Per Cents			
	Elementary		J. H. S.	
Scale Ratings	S*	R*	S*	R*
Outstanding	11	13	3	12
Above average	36	40	24	35
Average	29	35	29	47
Below average	18	9	26	3
Poor	6	3	18	3

---

*S - Sending Schools
R - Receiving Schools

Aspect of Evaluation and Comparison

---

(2) Extent of Children's Participation In Lesson (ILOR):

There was a statistically significant difference between the sending and receiving schools at both levels, with more children rated as participating in the lessons in the receiving schools than in the sending schools.

At the elementary level, more than half of the lessons in the receiving schools, as compared with one third of the lessons in the sending schools, were rated as having had "all children participating." However, about 40 per cent of the lessons in the sending school had "more than one-half" of the children participating.

At the JHS level more than 50 per cent of the sending schools' lessons were characterized as having few or less than half of the children participating, as compared with slightly more than 20 per cent in the receiving schools.

	Per Cents			
	Elementary		J. H. S.	
Scale Ratings	S*	R*	S*	R*
All participated	32	54	26	37
More than ½ participated	39	22	15	18
About ½ participated	13	10	6	22
Below ½ participated	8	10	32	20
Few Participated	8	4	21	3

---

(3) Children's Behavior (ILOR):

There was no statistically significant difference in the ratings between both sets of schools at the elementary level - although there was a bigger percentage of "extremely well behaved" ratings in the receiving schools and a smaller percentage of poorer ratings.

There was a statistically significant difference in the ratings at the JHS level, with the children in the receiving schools rated as being better behaved than the children in the sending schools. Ninety five per cent of the ratings indicated "extreme" or "well behaved" children as compared with 61 per cent of similar ratings in the sending JHS.

	Per Cents			
	Elementary		J. H. S.	
Scale Ratings	S*	R*	S*	R*
Extremely well behaved	27	40	29	52
Well behaved	47	44	32	43
Some good, some poorly behaved	22	14	21	5
Mostly poorly behaved	4	2	18	0

---

*S - Sending Schools
R - Receiving Schools

Aspect of Evaluation and Comparison

---

(4) Extent of Response to Teacher's Questions (ILOR):

In both the elementary and JHS there was a statistically significant difference between the sending and receiving schools. In the receiving schools more children responded to teacher's questions than in the sending schools.

In the elementary receiving schools 50 per cent of the lessons were rated as lessons in which "all" and "more than half" of the children responded to teacher's questions, as compared with similar ratings in only 32 per cent of the sending schools.

At the JHS level, few lessons in the sending schools were rated as involving "more than half" of the children, but about 30 per cent of the receiving school lessons were so judged.

	Per Cents			
	Elementary		J. H. S.	
Scale Ratings	S*	R*	S*	R*
Almost all	15	17	7	10
More than ½	17	33	3	18
One-half	38	22	19	23
Less than ½	19	19	29	37
Few or none	11	9	42	12

---

(5) Frequency of Children's Spontaneous Questioning (ILOR):

At the elementary school level there were no statistically significant differences between sets of schools. Children in both instances do almost no spontaneous questioning. At the JHS level there were statistically significant differences, with more than 90 per cent of the sending schools' lessons involving no spontaneous questioning as contrasted with about two-thirds of the receiving schools' lessons.

	Per Cents			
	Elementary		J. H. S.	
Scale Ratings	S*	R*	S*	R*
All or most	1	2	0	3
More than ½	1	4	3	0
About ½	4	5	0	0
Less than ½	10	10	6	35
Few or none	84	79	91	62

---

* S - Sending Schools
R - Receiving Schools

Aspect of Evaluation and Comparison

(6) Verbal Fluency of Children (ILOR):

There was a statistically significant difference between sending and receiving schools at both the elementary and JHS levels: at the elementary level, only 5 per cent of the lessons in the receiving schools were rated "below average" as compared with about 40 per cent of the lessons in the sending schools.

At the JHS level the comparison is even more striking. Approximately 70 per cent of the lessons in the sending schools, as contrasted with only 11 per cent on the receiving schools, were rated as indicating "below average" and "poor" verbal fluency.

	Per Cents			
	Elementary		J. H. S.	
Scale Ratings	S*	R*	S*	R*
Outstanding	2	11	0	3
Above average	19	39	3	26
Average	40	45	30	60
Below average	33	5	43	8
Poor	6	0	24	3

(7) Overall Interrelationship Among Children (GSR):

There was a statistically significant difference at both levels. Children in the receiving schools were rated as having more positive interrelationships than the children in the sending schools. At the elementary level, 25 per cent of the lessons observed in the sending schools and almost half (48 per cent) of the lessons rated in the receiving schools were characterized as having "extremely positive" or "positive" interrelationships among the children. In the receiving schools there were no "negative" or "extremely negative" ratings.

In the lessons observed at the JHS level, no "extremely positive" or "positive" ratings were given to the interrelationships among children in the sending schools. However, 67 per cent of the ratings of lessons in the receiving schools were "positive."

	Per Cents			
	Elementary		J. H. S.	
Scale Ratings	S*	R*	S*	R*
Extremely Positive	0	9	0	0
Positive	25	39	0	67
Average	55	52	43	33
Negative	20	0	43	0
Extremely Negative	0	0	14	0

---

* S - Sending Schools
R - Receiving Schools

Achievement in Reading

In the 1965-66 evaluation of the OE program data were obtained to identify children's current status in reading, their progress in reading during the academic year and comparative progress of a sample of OE children matched with children who remained in the sending school on age, sex, and reading level at the time that the OE child entered the program. These data indicated that progress during the 1965-1966 academic year was normal for sending school resident and OE children. In terms of overall levels of achievement, two-thirds (65 per cent) of the OE children were reading more than four-tenths of a year below grade level. Finally, of 212 matched pairs, the child who entered OE showed the greater gain 89 times, whereas the child who remained in the sending school showed the greater gain 114 times, with no difference for the remaining 9 pairs.

It was concluded that these data indicated no effect on reading achievement of participation in the OE program.

In this evaluation it was decided to expand, rather than repeat this analysis of reading data. Thus the OE children currently in grades 5 and 6 whom we had studied last year were followed up this year and their reading level as of April 1967 analyzed in terms of the number of years they had spent in OE. These data are presented in Table 3 on page 30. Then the gains from October 1966 to April 1967 were analyzed, not only to show gains during the year, but also to relate the gains

Table 3

Reading Level of OE Children Related to Number of Years in OE Program,

April 1967 Reading Levels, Fifth and Sixth Grade, In Per Cents

Grade	Completed Number of Years In OE	Number of Children	Per Cent of Children Reading: At, or Above Grade: More than 1 Yr.Above	At, to 1 Yr.Above	Below Grade: .1 to .4	.5 to .8	.9 to 1.6	1.7 to More
6	5 or 6	34	24	18	3	9	24	22
	4	53	22	21	4	17	20	16
	3	34	21	24	3	9	21	22
	2	109	21	14	5	12	25	23
	All Children	230	21	18	4	12	23	22
5	4 or 5	57	4	23	10	12	28	23
	3	56	7	20	5	14	29	25
	2	87	6	15	10	14	28	27
	All Children	200	6	19	9	13	28	25

to the child's level of achievement in October. These data are presented in Table 4.

Before turning to these tables, the first insight into reading level can be obtained by considering the median level of achievement as of April 1967. For the OE children we followed up this year, the 200 fifth graders had a median reading level of 4.7, one year below the normal expectation of 5.7. The 230 sixth graders fared better, for their median was 6.0, seven-tenths of a year below expectation. An equally meaningful comparison are the medians achieved by the children in the 11 sending schools studied. These medians were 4.4 in the fifth grade and 4.9 in the sixth grade. Thus although the OE children studied this year were reading below expectation in both the fifth and sixth grades, they were nevertheless reading three-tenths of a grade above the average fifth grader in the sending schools, and 1.1 years above the average sixth grader.[1]

This finding, that OE children were reading at higher levels than children in the sending schools, contrasts with the finding of the 1965-66 study in which children in the matched samples did not differ in reading progress. To account for this difference, one can assume either that one of the findings is wrong because of sampling errors, or that both findings are correct and the difference reflects the fact that children who enter OE do not typify the full range of ability in the sending schools

---

[1] A further comparison is provided by the medians for the 22 receiving schools. These medians were 6.0 in the fifth grade and 7.6 in the sixth grade, well above the medians for the OE children.

Table 4

Status of OE Children in Relationship to Grade Level in May 1966 AND April 1967, and Extent of Progress 1966-1967, by Grade.

Status in Relation to Grade Level, May '66 April '67	Progress May '66 to April '67	Per Cent At Each Status Level: Grade 5	Grade 6
1) At grade level or above	normal or more	7	14
	less than normal	7	11
2) Below grade in '66, at or above in '67	above normal	13	17
3) At or above in '66, below in '67	below normal	13	8
4) Below in '66 and below in '67	normal or more	14	22
	less than normal	46	28
All status levels	normal or more	34	53
	less than normal	66	47
Number of Children		175	205

but instead consist largely of the academically more able students.[2] The latter interpretation reconciles the findings by indicating that when OE and sending school children are matched for ability, they do not differ in progress in reading. However, when the OE children are compared to the full range of children in the sending school there are differences in favor of those who enter OE.

Table 3 presents the data on reading achievement by years completed of OE, for those fifth and sixth grade children for whom number of years in OE was available. The Table presents the percentage of children at various reading levels. There are three points of significance indicated in these data. First, the difference between fifth and sixth grade OE children, noted above in considering the medians, is further illustrated here. Whereas 39 per cent of the sixth graders were reading at or above grade level, only 25 per cent of the fifth graders were. The second point of interest is that number of years in OE did not have any consistent long-range effect on reading level. Considering the sixth graders, among those who completed two years in OE, 35 per cent were reading at or above grade level. This rose to 45 per cent among those who had completed three years, but did not change thereafter. Thus it was 43 per cent for those with four complete years, and 42 per cent for those with five or six years. Among the fifth graders a similar pattern held. Twenty-one per cent of those who completed two years were at or above grade level. This rose slightly to 27 per cent for those with three complete years, but was also 27 per cent for those with four or five years. Thus if length of time in OE has any effect on reading, it seems to center around the third year in the program.

---

[2] In Chapter V we shall present data from interviews with principals. Among these data is the finding that all but one of the sending school principals believed that academically able children are over-represented among those who enter OE.

Finally, the data in Table 3 also illustrate the extent of serious retardation even among children with long periods of time in the OE program. At the sixth grade, among children with 5 or 6 years in the OE program, 46 per cent were reading at least nine-tenths of a year below normal expectation, as were 36 per cent of those with four years of OE experience.

Similarly, among the fifth graders, 51 per cent of those with four years experience in the program were reading at least nine-tenths of a year below grade. Thus OE does not seem to be an immediate, or even long-range, solution to the overall problems of reading retardation.

Table 4 presents a re-analysis of the reading data for these fifth and sixth graders in OE, designed to illustrate the nature of progress between May 1966 and April 1967. The quickest insight into these data is provided by the last rows of the table, which indicate the proportion of children who showed a normal or above normal gain in the period between the Spring testing in 1966 and 1967. The fifth-sixth grade difference is seen here too. Among the fifth graders, 34 per cent gained normally in that period, as did 53 per cent of the sixth graders. The table also shows that most children did not change their status in relation to the norm. Those who began the year at or above grade level ended the year at that level; and those who began below, ended below. Categories 2 and 3 in the table represent change. At the fifth-grade level 26 per cent changed their status-evenly divided between those who improved and those who declined. At the sixth-grade level, 25 per cent changed - but twice as many improved their status as declined.

Overall then, this follow-up analysis of reading achievement indicates that the 1966-67 year was one of normal progress for the OE children in the sixth grade, but not for those in the fifth. Nevertheless, as noted earlier, in both grades the OE children were reading on the average, at higher grade levels than the children in the sending schools. Finally, the data indicate no consistent long-term effect of OE but offer some slight evidence of a differential impact after three years in the program.

Chapter IV

OVERALL SCHOOL APPRAISAL

On the General School Report (GSR), the observers were asked to rate the overall physical appearance, climate, and attitudinal structure of the school which they had just visited as well as to give their overall opinion about it. Specifically, the GSR asks for two ratings in the area of physical appearance, three in the area of climate, and two in the area of attitudinal structure. Of these seven items, at the elementary level there were differences for six, and all of the differences indicated more positive appraisal of the receiving school by the observers. Similarly, at the junior high school level, there were differences this time for all seven aspects, once again with all of the differences indicating more positive appraisal of the receiving schools.

The nature of these differences at the two levels were qualitatively different. At the elementary level, differences typically involved the sending school being rated as average and above average, whereas the receiving school was more consistently rated as above average or excellent. Thus both were positively rated, with the differences lying in the proportion if above-average ratings received. At the junior high school level this same positive picture characterized the receiving schools, which were rated as above average on every one of the seven aspects. In contrast, the sending junior high schools were rated as below average on three of the seven: general school climate, the extent to which a learning atmosphere characterized the school, and the attitudes of teachers towards children. For the other four aspects they were rated as average.

In brief the observers gave positive overall appraisals to both types of elementary schools, but were more enthusiastic about the general characteristics of the receiving schools. Similarly positive about the receiving junior high schools, they considered the sending junior high schools average or below.

In terms of overall opinion, we elicited it by asking the observer to indicate his feelings about having his own child in the school he had just visited. At both elementary and junior high levels the data were dramatically different: more than two-thirds of the observers would be enthusiastic or strongly positive about enrolling their child in the receiving schools while equally large majorities would feel negatively about sending their child to one of the sending schools.

OVERALL SCHOOL APPRAISAL

Aspect of Evaluation and Comparison

---

(1) Appearance of Building (GSR):

On both the elementary and JHS levels there was a statistically significant difference: the appearance of the building was rated more positively in the receiving schools than in the sending schools. In 50 per cent of the elementary receiving schools the appearance of the buildings was rated "above average" or "extremely attractive," as compared to only 13 per cent of the sending schools. Fifty-five per cent of the sending school buildings were perceived as "below average" or "unattractive."

In 50 per cent of the JH receiving schools the buildings were rated "above average" or "extremely attractive," as compared to 14 per cent of the sending schools. More than 40 per cent of the sending school and 12 per cent of the receiving school buildings were rated as "below average" and "unattractive."

Per Cents

	Elementary		J. H. S.	
Scale Ratings	S*	R*	S*	R*
Extremely attractive	0	14	0	12
Above average	13	36	14	38
Average	32	41	43	38
Below average	32	7	29	12
Unattractive	23	2	14	0

---

(2) Attractiveness of Classrooms in General (GSR):

There was a statistically significant difference at both levels: none of the elementary school classrooms were rated as "very attractive," while 30 per cent of the receiving school classrooms were so judged. At the other end of the scale, only 4 per cent of the receiving school classrooms were rated as "less than average," as compared with 41 per cent in the sending schools.

At the JHS level, 88 per cent of the classrooms in the receiving schools were rated as "average" or more than usually "attractive." About 43 per cent of the sending school classrooms received an "average" rating.

Per Cents

	Elementary		J. H. S.	
Scale Ratings	S*	R*	S*	R*
Very attractive	0	30	0	0
More than usual	41	41	0	63
Average	18	25	43	25
Less than average	27	4	43	12
Unattractive	14	0	14	0

---

* S - Sending Schools
R - Receiving Schools

Aspect of Evaluation and Comparison

---

(3) General School Climate (GSR):

There was a statistically significant difference in levels: the general school climate in the receiving schools was rated more positively than in the sending schools.

At the elementary level general school climate in the receiving schools was rated as "positive" and "extremely positive" two-thirds of the time, compared with about one-third such ratings in the sending schools. In the JH schools, 75 per cent of the classroom climates in the receiving schools were rated "extremely positive" or "positive" and the other quarter were rated as "average," while almost 60 per cent of the sending school classrooms received "negative" or "extremely negative" ratings.

	Per Cents			
	Elementary		J. H. S.	
Scale Ratings	S*	R*	S*	R*
Extremely positive	5	14	0	25
Positive	27	52	13	50
Average	45	32	29	25
Negative	9	2	29	0
Extremely negative	14	0	29	0

---

(4) Learning Atmosphere (GSR):

On both the elementary and JHS levels there was a statistically significant difference: the receiving schools were rated as having better atmospheres for learning than the sending schools.

About 85 per cent of the time the receiving elementary schools were rated as providing either a "good" or "excellent" learning atmosphere; in only half of the ratings were the sending schools judged similarly.

This difference is even more apparent at the JHS level: all of the receiving JHS were rated as providing a better than average, a "good" and "excellent," learning atmosphere. Only 42 per cent of the sending schools were rated "average," "good," and "excellent."

	Per Cents			
	Elementary		J. H. S.	
Scale Ratings	S*	R*	S*	R*
Sufficient Control For:				
Excellent Learning atmosphere	14	41	14	50
Good Learning atmosphere	36	43	14	50
Average Learning atmosphere	41	16	14	0
Lack of control for an average learning atmosphere	9	0	44	0
Too little control for learning	0	0	14	0

---

* S - Sending Schools
R - Receiving Schools

(5) The Classroom Atmosphere in Terms of Discipline and Warmth GSR):

On the elementary school level there was no statistically significant difference between the receiving and the sending schools: the overwhelming majority of the ratings described the classroom atmosphere as "disciplined, yet warm."

On the JHS level there was a statistically significant difference between the sending and the receiving schools: the atmosphere was warmer in the receiving schools. In regard to the JHS, virtually all of the receiving schools were "disciplined" and 85 per cent of these showed a "warm atmosphere" as well. In the sending schools 72 per cent of the classes were "disciplined" but only 46 per cent were rated "warm."

	Per Cents			
	Elementary		J. H. S.	
Scale Ratings	S*	R*	S*	R*
Undisciplined, warm	4	9	14	2
Undisciplined, cold	8	5	14	0
Disciplined,warm	70	67	46	83
Disciplined,cold	12	15	26	15
Overdisciplined, warm	6	2	0	0
Overdisciplined, cold	0	2	0	0
Total Warm	80	78	60	85
Total Cold	20	22	40	15

(6) Administrative Staff General Attitude (GSR):

There was a statistically significant difference in attitudes of administrative staff. In the receiving elementary and JH schools attitudes were rated more positively than in the sending schools.

In 71 per cent of the elementary receiving schools, the administrative staff's attitude was rated "positive" or "extremely positive." This was true of 50 per cent of the staff attitudes in the sending schools. On the other hand, in these latter schools attitudes were rated "negative" or "extremely negative" almost three times as often as in the receiving schools.

On the JHS level, 30 per cent of the sending schools received positive ratings. A quarter of the receiving schools were rated as having "extremely positive" administrative staff attitudes and 38 per cent of the remaining ratings fell into the "positive" category.

	Per Cents			
	Elementary		J. H. S.	
Scale Ratings	S*	R*	S*	R*
Extremely positive	14	8	0	25
Positive	36	63	29	38
Average	27	21	42	25
Negative	18	8	29	12
Extremely negative	5	0	0	0

---

* S - Sending Schools, R - Receiving Schools

Aspect of Evaluation and Comparison

(7) Teaching Staff Attitude to Children (GSR):

There was a statistically significant difference: in both sets of schools, the attitude of the teaching staff toward the children was rated more positively in the receiving schools than in the sending schools.

About 75 per cent of the elementary school ratings in the receiving schools were "positive" or "extremely positive," the remaining ratings fell into the "average" category. In the sending schools, about 50 per cent were "positive" or "extremely positive" and the rest of the ratings were "average," "negative," or "extremely negative."

In the case of the JHS, 75 per cent of the ratings of the receiving schools were either "positive" or "extremely positive" as compared with slightly more than 40 per cent in the sending school

	Per Cents			
	Elementary		J. H. S.	
Scale Ratings	S*	R*	S*	R*
Extremely positive	5	2	14	12
Positive	45	68	29	63
Average	36	30	14	25
Negative	9	0	43	0
Extremely negative	5	0	0	0

(8) Attitude of The Administrative Staff Towards the OE Program (GSR):

On both the elementary and the JHS levels there was a statistically significant difference: the administrative staff in the receiving schools had a more positive attitude towards OE than the staff in the sending schools.

At the elementary level, less than 20 per cent of the receiving school ratings indicated somewhat negative attitudes toward the program as compared with about 40 per cent of the ratings in the sending schools. On the other hand, the receiving schools were rated more often as being "positive with reservations" than were the sending schools.

In the JHS, almost three-quarters of the receiving school ratings are characterized as "completely positive" and "positive with reservations," as compared with 40 per cent of such ratings in the sending schools. Overall, the sending schools were rated as much more negative toward the program

	Per Cents			
	Elementary		J. H. S.	
Scale Ratings	S*	R*	S*	R*
Completely positive	5	8	0	14
Positive with reservations	28	46	40	58
Ambivalent	28	27	40	14
Negative, not completely	34	19	0	14
Completely negative	5	0	20	0

---

* S - Sending Schools
R - Receiving Schools

(9) Attitude of the Teaching Staff Towards OE Program In General (GSR):

On both elementary and JHS levels there was a statistically significant difference between the sending and receiving schools: the attitude was considered more positive in the receiving schools than in the sending schools.

On the elementary level about 30 per cent of the sending school ratings and about 70 per cent of the receiving school ratings indicated that the teaching staff had a somewhat or completely "positive" attitude toward the program. No ratings in either sending or receiving schools indicated a "completely negative" attitude.

On the JH level 40 per cent of the sending ratings and 83 per cent of the receiving school ratings indicated a "somewhat" or "completely positive" attitude toward the program. Again, the sending schools tended to be rated as more negative.

	Per Cents			
	Elementary		J. H. S.	
Scale Ratings	S*	R*	S*	R*
Completely positive	9	7	0	33
Positive with reservations	18	64	40	50
Ambivalent	55	25	20	0
Negative, not completely	18	4	20	17
Completely negative	0	0	20	0

(10) Observers Feelings About Having Own Child In School Visited (GSR):

There were statistically significant differences at both the elementary and JH levels. In both instances observers felt "strongly positive" and "enthusiastic" about enrolling their child in a receiving school, but "negative" about enrolling their child in a sending school. At the elementary level 73 per cent of the observers expressed negative feelings about enrolling a child of their own in a sending school, whereas about two-thirds expressed "enthusiastic" or "strongly positive" feelings about enrolling their child in a receiving school.

At the JH level the differences were even more pronounced. Every observer expressed either strongly positive or enthusiastic feelings about his child entering a receiving school with strongly negative feelings about the sending schools

	Per Cents			
	Elementary		J. H. S.	
Scale Ratings	S*	R*	S*	R*
Enthusiastic	0	25	0	25
Strongly positive	18	39	28	75
Positive	9	18	0	0
Slightly negative	41	14	0	0
Strongly negative	32	4	72	0

---

*S - Sending Schools
R - Receiving Schools

Lunch Facilities

In the 1965-66 evaluation of OE, observers frequently expressed negative feelings about provisions for lunch in the receiving schools. This was typically found to be related to the fact that prior to the introduction of the OE program few children in the receiving schools had had lunch in school; so many of these schools had no facilities for lunch.

Because this had been noted so often in the previous evaluation it was decided to ask observers to visit the lunch facilities and to rate four aspects: physical attractiveness, adequacy of the accommodations, overall atmosphere, and the extent to which discipline was maintained. In addition, in the elementary schools, observers were asked to comment on the extent to which seating was integrated. The data from the four rating items appear in Table 5.

All of the junior high, but only half of the elementary, receiving schools had separate lunchrooms. Those elementary schools which did not, used either the auditorium, classroom, or some other room in the building. Nevertheless, the physical attractiveness of the lunch facilities at both levels was most often rated as average, with fewer than 20 per cent of the ratings indicating that observer considered the physical attractiveness below average.

At the junior high school level the observers also considered these facilities as providing adequate or more than adequate room, and in only one school were they considered crowded. In contrast, in 40 per cent of

Table 5

Observers' Ratings of Facilities For Lunch,
Receiving Schools, by School Level

Characteristics	Options	Proportion Rated At Each Option	
		Elementary	Junior High
Physical Appearance	extremely attractive	7	0
	above average	10	25
	average	64	63
	below average	14	12
	extremely unattractive	5	0
Adequacy of Accomodations	more than adequate	9	12
	adequate	48	63
	crowded	43	25
Atmosphere, In General	relaxed and congenial	38	50
	strict, but congenial	45	38
	overly strict and cold	17	12
Discipline and Control	well controlled, not excessive	80	88
	excessively controlled	10	0
	undercontrolled	10	12

the elementary schools the facilities were considered crowded. In terms of atmosphere, at both levels the observers felt that the atmosphere was congenial, even if strict. Similarly, they felt the discipline being maintained was appropriate, and not excessive.

Asked to comment on the extent to which the lunchrooms in the elementary receiving schools were integrated in seating, in half of the schools the observers reported that they were. In the other half of the schools the observers reported that the OE children were seated separately, either because they alone were being served a hot lunch, or because of what the observers perceived to be self-segregation.

In summary, the concerns expressed by the observers in the 1965-66 evaluation of the OE program were not substantiated in this study. Except for crowding in the elementary schools (mostly those which lack a separate lunchroom) the observers positively appraised the facilities for lunch.

Observers' Perceptions of Strengths and Weaknesses in the Program

At the elementary level, at the conclusion of the GSR, the observers were given the opportunity to indicate their perceptions of the effective features and problems of the program of the school they had just visited. The single most effective feature in both sending and receiving schools was "effective teaching," with 22 observers noting this in the receiving schools and 9 in the sending schools.[1] Pupil participation and pupil behavior were each noted by five observers in the receiving schools, with no other feature noted by more than four observers. Observers noted they saw no "most effective feature" in the sending school which they visited.

Asked, in the receiving schools only, to note any specific advantages they attributed to the OE program, thirty times (out of a possible 44) an observer noted the integration of OE and resident children. Nine times they noted the opportunity for better education for the OE children, but five times they noted that they saw no special advantages.

When they turned to problems in the schools, both in general and as a result of OE in the receiving schools, the observers returned to teaching quality but in the sending schools they did not. Thus, in the receiving schools, 17 observers noted a problem of either poor teaching (12), disinterested teachers (3) or inexperienced teachers (2). In the sending schools no observer commented on poor quality teaching, although 5 noted uninterested teachers and 2 noted inexperienced teachers as a problem. No other problem was cited by as many as five observers in the receiving schools, although classes considered too large, and inadequacies in plant and equipment, were noted by five observers each in the sending schools.

---

[1] Each of the two observers noted one "most effective feature."

As to any special problems in the receiving schools which they attributed to the OE program, nine observers reported that they saw none. However, 18 reported a greater incidence of behavior problems (involving 11 different receiving schools); 11 reported a need for additional services and personnel; and six referred to the overcrowded lunchrooms noted earlier. Otherwise, no problem was mentioned by more than four observers.

Chapter V

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF AND ATTITUDES ABOUT THE OPEN ENROLLMENT PROGRAM

As was noted in the Procedure section, 32 of the 33 Principals[1] of the elementary schools which were involved in the 1966-67 evaluation were individually interviewed by both of the observers who visited their school.

Overall Attitude

As an overall appraisal of their feelings about the OE program, principals were asked to categorize their feelings about it when it began and now, and also to indicate what they believed the future of the program should be. Of the 10 sending school principals, eight provided an answer to these two questions. Of the eight, five were positive about the program both when it was introduced and now.

The majority stated that the reduced number of students in their schools permitted smaller classes and prevented probable double sessions. Two were negative then and still were. A loss of their brightest students and therefore a lower adacemic level was their major concern. One who was positive when the program was introduced now considered himself negative. His initial positive reaction was based on the prospect of smaller classes and a reduction in the number of sessions. But the "loss of the best children to other schools" changed his opinion of the program.

---

[1] It was not possible to schedule an interview with one sending school principal.

Of the 22 receiving school principals, 21 answered these questions. Fourteen were positive or enthusiastic about the program when it was introduced and still were. They felt their belief that the program would work proved true even though they recognized there would be problems. As one principal put it, it's "broadening for both residents and bussed-in children." The other seven indicated a change in opinion; four had gone from positive to negative feelings, mainly blaming the bussing and behavior problems for the change; and three had moved in the opposite direction; their overall feeling being that although there were problems they were not insurmountable.

Despite this ambivalence in feelings about the program, nine of the sending school principals and all but three of the receiving school principals believed that the OE program should be continued or expanded. Only one receiving school principal believed it should be abolished and two others were undecided as to their feelings about the future of the program, as was the one other sending school principal.

Aspects of Pupil Functioning and Participation

Questions were asked in both sending and receiving schools about changes in attitude and achievement. In the sending schools these questions referred to the children in the school, i.e., those who did not participate in the OE program. In the receiving schools, principals were asked about these changes separately for OE and resident children.

In the sending schools, only one principal reported seeing a change in the attitude and behavior of the children who remained in the school. He did not attribute this change, a "substantial improvement," to the OE program, but rather to general conditions in the nation. In discussing achievement the principals were evenly divided, with five reporting change (one saw improvement, four a decline) and the others none. Generally, the reported changes were not attributed to the OE program.

In the receiving schools, considering only resident children, half of the 22 principals saw no change in attitude. Of those who reported a difference, 3 felt there was an improvement and 8 saw the change as negative and all but 2 of them attributed at least half of the change to the OE program.

When asked about a change in achievement level four said they had noted a difference - and generally classified it as a slight drop, with opinions equally divided as to whether or not the OE program was the reason.

When asked about their perceptions of the effect of the program on the OE children who entered their schools, the receiving school principals were nearly unanimous in their belief that these effects had been positive. Eighteen (82 per cent) stated there was an improvement in personal and social adjustment. A like number of principals, although not necessarily the same individuals, saw an improvement in achievement. In both instances three quarters of the noted improvements were termed moderate or substantial.

In summary, the sending school principals reported no change in attitude and behavior, and the minority who reported changes in achievement did not attribute them to the program. In the receiving schools the principals indicated that the introduction of the OE program most often had no effect on attitude or achievement of resident children. When it did have an effect, that effect was to lower achievement levels slightly, and to result in negative changes in attitude almost three times as often as positive changes. In contrast, large majorities believed that the program benefited OE children in terms of social, personal adjustment, and achievement.

Asked if any steps had been taken to increase children's understanding of the program, three (30 per cent) sending school and 16 (73 per cent) receiving school principals reported that they had taken such steps. They specifically noted special assembly programs or class discussions when asked to indicate what they had done. Almost all the receiving school principals who ran these programs considered them to have been either moderately or greatly successful. The few sending school principals who ran them considered them to have had little, or moderate, success.

When they asked if they considered the children who applied to OE "typical of the student body in the sending school," every sending school principal and eight of the 14 receiving school principals who felt they had a basis for answering said they did not think so. Nine of the 10 sending school principals said that the child of high academic ability and potential was over-represented in OE, as did four of the 8 receiving school principals who felt the distribution was atypical. The tenth sending school principal felt that the "problem child" was over-represented, as did three of the receiving school principals. The other receiving school principal felt that the low middle-class child was over-represented, with the "real socially and culturally deprived child" under-represented.

The interview next considered dropouts from the program and entrance into it. The majority of principals (70 per cent sending, 73 per cent receiving), agreed that there was dropout and the majority agreed that each year only 1 or 2 and at most 5 or 6 children did dropout. However, almost half placed the yearly rate at one or 2 children with the other estimates ranging from 3 to at most 10.

The reasons most often given for dropout were the travel involved and the recognition that the child was not making an adequate adjustment to the program.

As to entrance into the program, receiving school principals agreed (68 per cent) that the earlier a child entered the program, the more positive the effect of the program on his social adjustment and achievement levels. Moreover, they felt that not only was grade of entry important, but so was initial achievement level, with the child entering at a good level more likely to profit from the program.

In keeping with these notions, when the principals were asked who they would admit to their "ideal OE program," while half (in both types of schools) said they would admit any child, the other half would admit only the bright, stable child. They were also split half and half in both types of schools as to the grades in which they would accept children into their ideal program: half would admit children in the early childhood grades, whereas the other half would admit up through grade five, as is now done.

Relationships With Parents

Parents of children in their schools had discussed the OE program with all of the sending school principals and 17 (77 per cent) of the receiving school principals. Moreover, all sending, and all but two receiving school principals had taken steps to increase parental understanding of the program through parent meetings and workshops. A majority in both types of schools believed that these efforts had been successful (70 per cent sending, 82 per cent receiving), with only one principal of each type of school believing they were unsuccessful. Receiving school principals noted that they believed parents who had positive opinions about OE were parents who believed in integration. They also noted that negative attitudes stemmed from a fear that OE would lower the quality of education provided in the schools, or would foster community integration.

Asked specifically about their relationships with parents of OE children, the receiving school principals most often (55 per cent) reported "some, but infrequent" discussions. The others were divided between those who reported frequent discussions (27 per cent) and those who reported no discussions (18 per cent). Despite the limited discussions, almost all of the principals believed that the parents of the OE children were enthusiastic about the program.

Relationships With Teachers

Principals were also asked about their perception of teaching staff's reaction to the program. In the sending schools, only 2 principals reported that the staff discussed the program with them, whereas in the receiving schools 19 of the 22 reported discussing the program with their staff. Asked to estimate staff opinion, two-thirds of the principals of the receiving schools felt that half or more of their staff had positive feelings about the program, with one third believing all or most of their staff was positive. A comparable majority of the sending school principals believed that their staff held negative feelings about the program, because through it, the sending schools were losing their brightest pupils. In both sending and receiving schools, principals attributed the positive staff feelings to the belief in integration, with negative feelings among receiving school staff attributed to the lack of services and programs ordinarily provided special service schools.

All 22 receiving school principals had taken steps to increase the understanding of the program by teachers. These steps not only involved staff meetings and conferences but ranged up to in-service training programs and the establishment of a Human Relations Committee. The principals noted that most or all of the staff participated, and they, the principals, believed that these efforts were moderately or extremely effective. This view of the principals was corroborated by the data from the observers, everyone of whom rated teachers attitude towards the children in the receiving schools average or above, with 70 per cent of the ratings above average.

Finally, asked about requests for transfer, and the rate of resignation or retirement since the introduction of the OE program, 80 per cent of the sending, and 73 per cent of the receiving school principals reported no change, with all of the others reporting an increase. Of the six receiving school principals who did report an increase, four attributed it to the introduction of the OE program into their school.

Strengths and Weaknesses of the Program

Sending school principals noted five weaknesses in the OE program: lack of parent involvement in selecting the school to which the child is bussed (4 principals); lack of planning for the overall program (3); lack of parental interest (2); the loss of their best students and the problems of bussing (1 each). The receiving schools principals too noted five weaknesses. More than half (13) noted problems concerned with bussing and schedules such as the lack of supervision on the bus and the fact that bus schedules exclude the OE child from school life after classes are out.[1] Ten commented on the lack of special services and personnel in their schools to compensate for the increased demand for such services and specialized help brought about by the OE program. Six noted the lack of contact with the OE parents as a weakness, and four felt that the increased incidence of behavior problems in their school was another weakness. Allied to this comment on behavior problems were another three principals who felt that the lack of properly selective screening procedures was a weakness.

On the other side of the coin, principals were asked about the most valuable contribution of the program. Although their perception of weaknesses had been different, the sending and receiving school principals had similar perceptions of the program's contributions: the promotion of integration (4 sending, and 16 receiving) and the realizing of children's potential through quality education (3 sending and 9 receiving). Three sending school principals also noted their belief that a major contribution of the program was that it provided "a safety valve for those parents who are discontented," or "dissatisfied."

A final question asked the principals for suggestions for improving the program. No sending school principal offerred more than one, and two gave none. Three felt that the sending schools should be built up and a fourth responded in that vein by suggesting that two-way open enrollment be instituted. Two wanted a better method for assigning children to schools, and one each suggested screening out the under-achiever and eliminating OE below grade two.

---

[1] This was also the most frequent problem identified in the 1965-66 evaluation.

The receiving school principals, as might be expected, had more suggestions to offer, and also as might be expected these were directly related to the weaknesses they perceived in the program. Thus, they wanted additional services and personnel (15 principals); improved bussing practices (8); better screening of children before entering OE (7); improved parental cooperation from OE parents (3); smaller classes (2); special recruitment of principals for OE schools (2); and curriculum enrichment (1).

Chapter VI

CONCLUSIONS

In coming to overall conclusions about the Free-Choice Open Enrollment program, one must consider the elementary school and junior high school levels separately for the data were different.

Elementary Level

First, the observers reported no differences in the in-class functioning of teachers in receiving and sending schools for any of the 11 aspects of the teaching process which we evaluated, nor did they differ significantly on the 19 item Teacher Behavior Record. The one aspect involving teachers on which the sending and receiving schools did differ involved overall teacher attitude towards the children, with a small proportion (14 per cent) of the observers rating teacher attitude as negative after their day in a sending school whereas no observer ever gave a negative rating to teacher attitude in the receiving schools.

Thus, these data contradict the often voiced argument that teachers function differently in schools in disadvantaged neighborhoods than in schools in favored neighborhoods. Moreover, since the ratings for the eleven aspects studied indicated average or above average functioning in most instances, these data also lead to the conclusion that teachers in the sending and receiving elementary schools studied were functioning in accord with professionally accepted standards of good classroom practice.

In terms of children functioning, there were consistent differences indicating more effective functioning by children in OE compared to children in the sending schools. Thus, of the six characteristics of children which the observers rated, there were differences for three aspects; volunteering, participation and verbal fluency. All three differences indicated that the children who entered OE were functioning better than the children who remained in the sending schools. Equally important, on these, as well as on the other three aspects of children's functioning rated, the OE children were rated as functioning as effectively as their resident classmates. A similar higher level of functioning for children in OE compared to children in the sending schools was indicated by the analysis of the data on reading achievement in grades five and six. However, in reading, the children in OE were not functioning comparably to their resident grademates.

The observers did note differences in overall aspects of school climate and attitudinal structure, and it was at this level of the total impact of a school, where the ratings in receiving and sending schools were most sharply differentiated. The overall effect of what they saw and felt during the course of their visit apparently cumulated to different perceptions of school climate and attitude, although the specific ratings in class did not reflect these final differences.

The conclusions of the 1965-66 evaluation of the OE program at the elementary level was that the data of that evaluation indicated that children gained in terms of social and personal functioning, but not in terms of academic achievement. These new data indicate that they also gain in terms of classroom functioning, particularly in terms of participation and verbal fluency. These new data on reading also indicate that the OE children did better than the average child in the sending school, but that there was no evidence of steady long-term improvement in reading level, as the child spent more of his school career in an Open Enrollment school.

Junior High School

At the junior high school level the findings can be summarized simply: the observers saw two different qualitative levels of schools. They found the receiving junior high schools studied average or above in all of the facets of the educational process which we studied: teacher functioning, children's functioning, and overall characteristics of the school. In contrast, the sending junior high schools were considered average in teacher functioning, below average in most aspects of children's functioning and below average in most aspects of overall school characteristics. Thus, where everyone of the observers would have felt strongly positive or enthusiastic about having his own child in any of the receiving junior high schools, only 28 per cent of the time would they have felt this way about having a child in one of the sending junior high schools.

Thus, within the limits of the sample of eight schools studied, these data from the junior high schools indicated that the child who enters the OE program in the elementary school moves on to better junior high schools than the child who remains in a sending school.

Overall Conclusions: 1965-66

Looking back across the two evaluations of the Free-Choice Open Enrollment program certain conclusions seem soundly founded in the data. First, the overall response to the program has been good. In the 1965-66 evaluation, the all but unanimously favorable response of the children being bussed was echoed by a large majority of the resident children in the receiving schools. At the professional level, of all staff positions interviewed, a majority spoke favorably of the program, and in this current evaluation, the principals of both sending and receiving schools add a near unanimous voice that the program should be continued or expanded.

To the benefits for OE children which the 1965-66 study demonstrated in the areas of personal and social functioning, particularly in perception of school and class, this current evaluation has added evidence that they do better in reading than the average child in the sending school, and also evidence that they move on to better junior high schools.

The current evaluation also provided indications of a potential problem in voluntary programs like the Free-Choice program: that the sending schools will lose atypically large proportions of their academically more able pupils. This was flatly stated as a fact by nine of the ten sending school principals interviewed and by four of the fourteen receiving school principals who felt they knew the distribution of ability in the sending schools well enough to answer. It was further indicated by the data from the two evaluations on reading achievement. In the 1965-66 study no differences were found in comparative achievement between OE and sending school children matched for reading ability when the OE child entered the program. However, in this year's evaluation, differences were found between these same OE children now in the fifth and sixth grades and the median (average) child in the sending schools in those grades. These two findings suggest a selective entry into OE by the academically more able child, an aspect of the program which would have serious educational and psychological implications for the educational process in the sending schools. The already serious problems of developing quality educational programs in the schools in economically disadvantaged areas of the city would obviously be seriously compounded if those schools began to consist largely of academically less able pupils.

The current reading data from OE children in both fifth and sixth grades indicates that there is no overall steady improvement in their reading ability, the longer the time they spend in the program. At both grades the data indicate that the third year in the program was slightly more productive in the area of reading than earlier, or later, years, but this is an indication rather than a finding and would need substantiation with larger samples before its implications and potential causes were worth pondering. We have concluded on the basis of these samples studied, that the data provide no consistent evidence of a long-term effect of the OE program on reading achievement.

The problems identified in the 1965-66 evaluation were still very much in existence in 1966-67. Bussing was still largely unsupervised and principals still objected to the lack of supervision. Scheduling of the program still ruled out any participation of OE children in the after-school activities of the receiving schools. An important new problem identified in the interviews with the sending school principals was their feeling that parents in the sending schools were insufficiently involved in the process by which children are assigned to a receiving school. These problems, as well as the one discussed above on selective entry into the program, are concerns to which communities planning programs to achieve school integration should be alert.

Perhaps the clearest conclusions concern the potential impact of Open Enrollment on the quality of education in the receiving schools. At both the elementary and junior high school level the receiving schools were rated as average, and more often above average, in the many facets of the educational process we studied. There was no indication in these data that designation as a receiving school adversely effected the ability of these schools to provide quality education. This finding from the observers was corroborated by the principals of these schools, for 18 or the 22 interviewed reported that since OE there had been no change in the level of achievement of the resident children. It was further corroborated by the data on reading achievement which indicated that the receiving schools, including all children, were well above normal reading levels in all grades. This finding indicates that the gains for OE children which these two evaluations have indicated have been achieved without loss for resident children.

APPENDIX A

Tables are included in the body of the text.

Appendix B - INSTRUMENTS

EXPANSION OF THE FREE CHOICE OPEN ENROLLMENT PROGRAM

List of Instruments

Individual Lesson Observation Report - Receiving School B1

Individual Lesson Observation Report - Sending School B7

Teacher Behavior Record B13

General School Report - End of First Visit, Sending and Receiving Schools B15

OE Receiving School Supplementary Questionnaire B18

General Classroom Report - Receiving Schools B21

General Classroom Report - Sending Schools B22

Principal's Interview - Receiving School B23

Principal's Interview - Sending School B32

Center for Urban Education
Open Enrollment

INDIVIDUAL LESSON OBSERVATION REPORT - RECEIVING SCHOOL

School__________ Borough__________ Class_____ Grade_____ Date_____

Teacher's Name__________Sex__________ Observer__________

Length of Observation__________ Activities Observed_______

____

If this is a joint observation, check here ___ and record name of other observer ______________________. Joint observations should be reported by each observer without consultation.

1. Was grouping employed in this lesson?

   1. Yes
   2. No

If yes, please explain below the method of grouping used and answer questions 2-7. If grouping was not employed please go directly to question 8.

2. Rationale or method of grouping______________________

   ____

   ____

3. Number of groups______________________

4. Size of groups______________________

5. Were OE children included in all groups?

   1. Yes
   2. No, in some only. Which?______________
   8. I could not distinguish OE children
   9. No OE children in class

6. If any groups did not receive direct instruction in this lesson, how would you rate the activities of the groups?

   1. Exceptionally well organized and meaningful
   2. Organized and meaningful
   3. Organized but little meaning
   4. Not well organized but meaningful
   5. Not well organized and little meaning
   8. All groups received direct instruction

7. How would you rate the teacher's adaptation of response and materials to the number of students in the group(s) receiving direct instruction?

   1. Excellent adaptation to unit size: at least some things done unique to unit size
   2. Effective efforts made to utilize group size
   3. Some effort made to adapt to unit size
   4. Little or no effort made to adapt to unit size

Now, for the remainder of this questionnaire, consider only the group or groups receiving direct instruction.

8. Content of lesson observed

    1. Reading
    2. Spelling
    3. Math
    4. Science
    5. Social Studies
    6. Music or Art
    7. Language Arts
    8. Other ____________________

9. Did you see entire lesson?

    1. Yes
    2. No, I missed beginning
    3. No, I missed end

10. Who taught this lesson?

    1. Regular classroom teacher
    2. "Cluster teacher"
    3. Special Staff. Indicate who: ____________________
    4. More than one member of the staff. Indicate who: ____________________

11. What amount of planning and organization was evident in this lesson?

    1. Lesson was exceptionally well organized and planned
    2. Lesson was well organized and planned
    3. Lesson showed some signs of teacher organization and planning
    4. Lesson showed few or no signs of organization or planning

12. How would you characterize the level of creativity and imagination evidenced in this lesson?

    1. Extremely creative Why? ____________________
    2. Moderately creative
    3. Average
    4. Somewhat stereotyped
    5. Very uncreative and stereotyped
    8. Not relevant for this lesson

13. To what extent did this lesson refer to earlier material?

    1. Considerable reference to previous lessons
    2. Some reference to previous lessons
    3. No reference to previous lessons
    8. No reason for reference to earlier material

14. To what extent did this lesson lay a foundation for future lessons?

    1. Considerable possibility for continuity
    2. Some opportunity for continuity
    3. Little or no possibility for continuity
    8. Little possibility for continuity in the material.

15. To what extent did this lesson lay a foundation for independent work?

1. Considerable possibility for independent work
2. Some opportunity for independent work
3. Little or no possibility for independent work
8. Little possibility for independent work in the material

16. To what extent did the lessons use and/or take advantage of the experience of OE children?

1. Consistent use of OE Child's experiences
2. Some use of OE child's experiences
3. Little or no use of OE child's experience
4. Question not applicable to lesson. Explain: ____________________

8. I could not distinguish OE children
9. No OE children in group(s)

17. What was the range of pupil ability in the lesson group (or groups) receiving direct instruction?

1. All of above average ability
2. Average and above average ability
3. Above average. average, and below average
4. All average
5. Average and below average
6. All below average

18. How would you rate the teacher's response to the range of pupil ability?

1. Effective efforts to utilize range of pupil ability
2. Some efforts made to adapt to range of pupil ability levels
3. Little or no effort made to adapt to range of pupil ability

19. To what extent, and how effectively, were teaching aids utilized?

1. Wide variety used and used creatively and effectively
2. Wide variety used but not particularly effectively
3. Some used and used creatively and effectively
4. Some used but not particularly effectively
5. Little or no use of teaching aids
8. Not relevant

For the following questions we ask you to do two things. First use the numbers to the left of the question to give an overall rating based on the entire group or class observed. Second, use the two columns of numbers at the right of the rating scale to give separate ratings for Resident and OE children. If you can not distinguish OE from Resident children or if there are no OE children in the group(s) you are observing, please circle the appropriate number below and use only the column to the left of the question to rate the total group:

8. I could not distinguish OE children
9. No OE children in group(s)

20. How would you rate the children's behavior?

OVERALL	RESIDENT	OE
1. Extremely well behaved	1	1
2. Well behaved	2	2
3. Some well, some poorly behaved	3	3
4. Mostly poorly behaved	4	4

21. How would you rate the children's interest and enthusiasm?

OVERALL	RESIDENT	OE
1. Outstanding	1	1
2. Better than average	2	2
3. Average	3	3
4. Below average	4	4
5. Extremely poor	5	5

22. Considering the lesson you have just seen how would you rate the participation of the children?

	OVERALL	RESIDENT	OE
1.	Every or almost every child actively involved	1	1
2.	More than half participated	2	2
3.	About half participated	3	3
4.	Less than half participated	4	4
5.	Few children participated in the lesson	5	5

23. How would you rate the verbal fluency of the children who participated?

	OVERALL	RESIDENT	OE
1.	Outstanding	1	1
2.	Better than average	2	2
3.	Average	3	3
4.	Below Average	4	4
5.	Extremely poor	5	5

24. How many children volunteered in response to teacher questions?

	OVERALL	RESIDENT	OE
1.	Every or almost every child	1	1
2.	More than half the children	2	2
3.	About half the children	3	3
4.	Less than half the children	4	4
5.	Very few or no volunteering	5	5
8.	Not relevant		

25. How many children raised spontaneous questions?

	OVERALL	RESIDENT	OE
1.	Every or almost every child	1	1
2.	More than half the children	2	2
3.	About half the children	3	3
4.	Less than half the children	4	4
5.	Very few or no children raised spontaneous quest.	5	5
8.	Not relevant		

26. How would you describe the teacher's handling of the children's spontaneous questions?

	OVERALL	RESIDENT	OE
1.	Questions were welcomed and built on	1	1
2.	Questions were answered cursorily	2	2
3	Questions were ignored	3	3
4.	Questions were repressed	4	4
8.	Not relevant		

27. How would you rate the teacher's verbal communication with the children?

	OVERALL	RESIDENT	OE
1.	Excellent	1	1
2.	Better than average	2	2
3.	Average	3	3
4.	Below average	4	4
5.	Extremely poor	4	5

28. How would you generally rate the verbal communication among the children?

	OVERALL	RESIDENT	OE
1.	Excellent	1	1
2.	Better than average	2	2
3.	Average	3	3
4.	Below average	4	4
5.	Extremely poor	5	5
8.	Not relevant ______________________		

____

29. How would you rate the teacher's communication with non-English speaking children?

	OVERALL	RESIDENT	OE
1.	Excellent	1	1
2.	Better than average	2	2
3.	Average	3	3
4.	Below average	4	4
5.	Extremely poor	5	5
8.	Not relevant ______________________		

____

30. What opportunities were there for the child to relate this lesson to his own background and experience?

	OVERALL	RESIDENT	OE
1.	Consistent opportunities for child to relate to his own experience and/or bring experience to lesson	1	1
2.	Some opportunity for child to relate lesson to his experience and use experience in lesson	2	2
3.	Lesson was remote from child's experience	3	3
8.	Question not applicable. Explain: ______________		

____

Considering the ratings you have given above, what final evaluation of this lesson would you make in terms of criteria underlined?

31. How typical do you think this lesson was of normal functioning in this classroom?

1. Completely typical
2. Reasonable approximation
3. Less than reasonable approximation. Why? ______________

____

32. How would you rate the lesson you have just seen, considering the amount of material covered?

1. Outstanding
2. Better than average
3. Average
4. Below average
5. Extremely poor

33. How would you rate the lesson you have just seen, considering the depth of lesson?

    1. Outstanding
    2. Better than average
    3. Average
    4. Below average
    5. Extremely poor

34. How would you rate the lesson you have just seen, considering the quality of instruction?

    1. Outstanding
    2. Better than average
    3. Average
    4. Below Average
    5. Extremely poor

Additional comments on class observed:

Note: On original questionnaire, questions calling for extended comments allowed considerably more space than is shown here.

Center for Urban Education

Open Enrollment

INDIVIDUAL LESSON OBSERVATION REPORT - SENDING SCHOOLS

School________ Borough ______ Class ________ Grade ________ Date ________

Teacher's Name ______________________ Sex _____ Observer __________________

Length of observation _______________ Activities Observed _________________

____

If this is a joint observation, check here _____ and record name of other observer ______________________________. Joint observations should be reported by each Observer without consultation. (Note to observer: The question numbers correspond to another questionnaire and are not necessarily consecutive.)

1. Was grouping employed in this lesson?

   1. Yes
   2. No

2. If yes, please explain below the method of grouping used and answer questions 2-7. If grouping was not employed please go directly to question 8.

   2. Rationale or method of grouping ________________________

      ____

      ____

   3. Number of groups____

   4. Size of groups____

   6. If any groups did not receive direct instruction in this lesson, how would you rate the activities of the groups?

      1. Exceptionally well organized and meaningful
      2. Organized and meaningful
      3. Organized but little meaning
      4. Not well organized but meaningful
      5. Not well organized and little meaning
      8. All groups received direct instruction

   7. How would you rate teacher's adaptation of response and materials to the number of students in the group(s) receiving direct instruction?

      1. Excellent adaptation to unit size: at least some things done unique to unit size
      2. Effective efforts made to utilize group size
      3. Some effort made to adapt to unit size
      4. Little or no effort made to adapt to unit size

Now, for the remainder of this questionnaire, consider only the group or groups receiving direct instruction.

8. Content of lesson observed

1. Reading
2. Spelling
3. Math
4. Science
5. Social Studies
6. Music or Art
7. Language Arts
8. Other ______________________

9. Did you see entire lesson?

1. Yes
2. No, I missed beginning
3. No, I missed end

10. Who taught this lesson?

1. Regular classroom teacher
2. "Cluster teacher"
3. Special Staff. Indicate who: ______________________
4. More than one member of the staff. Indicate who; ______________________

____

11. What amount of planning and organization was evident in this lesson?

1. Lesson was exceptionally well organized and planned
2. Lesson was well organized and planned
3. Lesson showed some signs of teacher organization and planning
4. Lesson showed few or no signs of organization or planning

12. How would you characterize the level of creativity and imagination evidenced in this lesson?

1. Extremely creative } Why? ______________________
2. Moderately creative }
3. Average ______________________________
4. Somewhat stereotyped ______________________________
5. Very uncreative and stereotyped
8. Not relevant for this lesson.

13. To what extent did this lesson refer to earlier material?

1. Considerable reference to previous lessons
2. Some reference to previous lessons
3. No reference to previous lessons
8. No reason for reference to earlier material

14. To what extent did this lesson lay a foundation for future lessons?

1. Considerable possibility for continuity
2. Some opportunity for continuity
3. Little or no possibility for continuity
8. Little possibility for continuity in the material

15. To what extent did this lesson lay a foundation for independent work?

    1. Considerable possibility for independent work
    2. Some opportunity for indpendent work
    3. Little or no possibility for independent work
    8. Little possibility for independent work in the material

17. What was the range of pupil ability in the lesson group (or groups) receiving direct instruction?

    1. All of above average ability
    2. Average and above average ability
    3. Above average, average, and below average
    4. All above average
    5. Average and below average
    6. All below average

18. How would you rate the teacher's response to the range of pupil ability?

    1. Effective efforts to utilize range of pupil ability
    2. Some efforts made to adapt to range of pupil ability levels
    3. Little or no effort made to adapt to range of pupil ability

19. To what extent, and how effectively, were teaching aids utilized?

    1. Wide variety used and used creatively and effectively
    2. Wide variety used but not particularly effectively
    3. Some used and used creatively and effectively
    4. Some used but not particularly effectively
    5. Little or no use of teaching aids
    8. Not relevant

Now give an overall rating in terms of the criteria underlined for the group or groups you observed receiving direct instruction in this lesson.

20. How would you rate the children's behavior?

    1. Extremely well behaved
    2. Well behaved
    3. Some well, some poorly behaved
    4. Mostly poorly behaved

21. How would you rate the children's interest and enthusiasm?

    1. Outstanding
    2. Better than average
    3. Average
    4. Below average
    5. Extremely poor

22. Considering the lesson you have just seen how would you rate the participation of the children?

    1. Every or almost every child actively involved
    2. More than half participated
    3. About half participated
    4. Less than half participated
    5. Few children participated in the lesson

23. How would you rate the verbal fluency of the children who participated?

    1. Outstanding
    2. Better than average
    3. Average
    4. Below Average
    5. Extremely poor

24. How many children volunteered in response to teacher questions?

    1. Every or almost every child
    2. More than half the children
    3. About half the children
    4. Less than half the children
    5. Very few or no volunteering
    8. Not relevant ____

    ____

25. How many children raised spontaneous questions?

    1. Every or almost every child
    2. More than half the children
    3. About half the children
    4. Less than half the children
    5. Very few or no children raised spontaneous questions
    8. Not relevant ____

    ____

26. How would you describe the teacher's handling of the children's spontaneous questions?

    1. Questions were welcomed and built on
    2. Questions were answered cursorily
    3. Questions were ignored
    4. Questions were repressed
    8. Not relevant ____

    ____

27. How would you rate the teacher's verbal communication with the children?

    1. Excellent
    2. Better than average
    3. Average
    4. Below average
    5. Extremely poor

28. How would you generally rate the verbal communication among the children?

    1. Excellent
    2. Better than average
    3. Average
    4. Below average
    5. Extremely poor
    8. Not relevant ____

    ____

29. How would you rate the teacher's communication with non-English speaking children?

    1. Excellent
    2. Better than average
    3. Average
    4. Below average
    5. Extremely poor
    8. Not relevant ______________________________

    ____

30. What opportunities were there for the child to relate this lesson to his background and experience?

    1. Consistent opportunities for child to relate to his own experience and/or bring experience to lesson
    2. Some opportunity for child to relate lesson to his experience and use experience in lesson
    3. Lesson was remote from child's experience
    8. Question not applicable. Explain: ______________________________

    ____

Considering the ratings you have given above, what final evaluation of this lesson would you make in terms of criteria underlined?

31. How typical do you think this lesson was of normal functioning in this classroom?

    1. Completely typical
    2. Reasonable approximation
    3. Less than reasonable approximation. Why? ______________________________

    ____

32. How would you rate the lesson you have just seen, considering the amount of material covered?

    1. Outstanding
    2. Better than average
    3. Average
    4. Below average
    5. Extremely poor

33. How would you rate the lesson you have just seen, considering the depth of lesson?

    1. Outstanding
    2. Better than average
    3. Average
    4. Below average
    5. Extremely poor

34. How would you rate the lesson you have just seen, considering the quality of instruction?

1. Outstanding
2. Better than average
3. Average
4. Below average
5. Extremely poor

Additional comments on class observed:

TEACHER BEHAVIOR RECORD

School__________ Borough___________ Class_________ Grade______ Date________

Teacher's name________________________Sex_____ Observer____________________

Length of observation________________ Activities observed___________________

If this is a joint observation, check here_____ and record name of other observer _________________. Joint observations should be reported by each observer without consultation.

Instructions: On the basis of teacher behavior observations in the classroom, check one of the seven choices for each of the following categories. A low number indicates that a person is more like the description on the left. A high number indicates that a person is more like the description on the right. Number 4 is midway between each pair of opposite descriptions. Number 4 represents non-extreme, average behavior.

				Mid-Point				
1. Autocratic: told pupils each step to take; gave mandatory directions; intolerant of pupils' ideas	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Democratic: encouraged ideas, opinions, and decisions of pupils; guided without being mandatory
2. Aloof: stiff and formal with pupils; focus on subject matter and routine; pupils as persons ignored	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Responsive: approachable to all students; gave encouragement and spoke to pupils as equals recognized individual differences
3. Dull: uninteresting monotonous explanations; lacked enthusiasm; not challenging	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Stimulating: held attention of pupils; enthusiastic; interesting and challenging material
4. Partial: slighted or criticized a few pupils; or gave attention and special advantages to a few pupils	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Fair: treated all pupils about equally; distributed attention to many pupils
5. Apathetic: listless; preoccupied; bored by pupils	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Alert: bouyant; constructively busy; wide-awake; interested in class activity
6. Unsympathetic: little concern for personal problems of pupils or pupil failure; impatient with pupils	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Understanding: patient and sympathetic with pupil viewpoints and needs; aware of pupil problems
7. Stereotyped: used routine procedures without variation; unimaginative presentation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Original: used unique teaching devices; imaginative; had wide variety of illustrations
8. Harsh: hypercritical; cross; sarcastic; scolding	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Kindly: pleasant and helpful to pupils; friendly and concerned

(PLEASE CONTINUE ON NEXT PAGE)

				Mid-Point				
9. **Inarticulate**: inaudible speech; limited expression; disagreeable voice tone; poor inflection	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	**Fluent**: plainly audible speech; good expression; agreeable voice tone; good inflection
10. **Unattractive**: untidy; inappropriately dressed; poor posture and bearing; distracting personal habits	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	**Attractive**: well-groomed and dressed; good posture and bearing; no distracting personal habits
11. **Evading**: avoided responsibility and decisions; assignments and directions indefinite; help inadequate	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	**Responsible**: made required decisions; conscientious; gave definite directions; thorough
12. **Erratic**: impulsive; uncontrolled; inconsistent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	**Steady**: controlled; stable; consistent; predictable
13. **Uncertain**: unsure of self; hesitant; timid; faltering, artificial	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	**Confident**: sure of self; self-confident; undisturbed by mistakes and/or criticism
14. **Excitable**: easily disturbed and upset; "jumpy," nervous	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	**Calm**: seemed at ease at all times; poised; dignified but not stiff or formal
15. **Disorganized**: objectives not apparent; explanations not to the point; wasted time; easily distracted from matter at hand	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Systematic: careful planning; gave reasonable explanations; objectives apparent; not easily distracted
16. **Inflexible**: rigid in conforming to routine; made no attempt to adapt materials and activities to individual pupils	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	**Adaptable**: flexible in adapting explanations; individualized materials for pupils as required; adapted activities to pupils
17. **Pessimistic**: skeptical; unhappy; noted mistakes more than good points; frowned	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Optimistic: cheerful; good-natured; genial; looked on bright side; called attention to good points
18. **Immature**: naive; self-pitying; demanding; boastful; conceited	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	**Integrated**: maintained class as center of activity; kept self out of spotlight; mature; emotionally well controlled
19. **Narrow**: limited background in subject or material; poor scholarship; incomplete or inaccurate information	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	**Broad**: good background in subject; good scholarship; gave complete and accurate answers to questions

B15

OPEN ENROLLMENT

Sending and Receiving Schools

General School Report - End of First Visit

School________ Borough_________ Date_________ Observer___________________

1. How would you rate the appearance of the building?

    1. extremely attractive
    2. of greater than average attractiveness
    3. average
    4. of less than average attractiveness
    5. generally unattractive

2. How would you rate the general appearance of the classrooms you have seen?

    1. consistently very attractive
    2. most rooms attractive
    3. some classrooms attractive
    4. most of the classrooms were unattractive
    5. classrooms were consistently unattractive

3. What is the general school climate?

    1. extremely positive
    2. positive
    3. average
    4. negative
    5. extremely negative

4. How would you rate the general attitude of the administrative staff?

    1. extremely positive
    2. positive
    3. average
    4. negative
    5. extremely negative

5. How would you characterize the attitude of the administrative staff towards the OE program in general? (not as it affects this school only)

    1. completely positive
    2. positive but with some reservations
    3. ambivalent
    4. negative but not completely
    5. completely negative

6. How would you characterize the attitude of the teaching staff towards the OE program in general? (not as it affects this school only)

    1. completely positive
    2. positive but with some reservations
    3. ambivalent
    4. negative but not completely
    5. completely negative

7. What was the general attitude of the teaching staff towards the children?
    1. extremely positive
    2. positive
    3. average
    4. negative
    5. extremely negative

8. What was the general attitude of the children toward the teaching staff?
    1. extremely positive
    2. positive
    3. average
    4. negative
    5. extremely negative

9. How would you characterize discipline in these classes?
    1. Sufficient control and quiet for excellent learning atmosphere
    2. Sufficient control and quiet for a good learning atmosphere
    3. Sufficient control and quiet for an average learning atmosphere
    4. Lack of sufficient control and quiet for an average learning atmosphere
    5. Too chaotic and noisy for learning.

    Additional comments ____

    ____

10. How would you describe the interaction among the children?
    1. extremely positive
    2. positive
    3. average
    4. negative
    5. extremely negative

    If you circled option 4 or 5, in question 10, please explain why.

    ____

    ____

11. What do you believe was the single most effective feature in the classrooms you visited?

    ____

    ____

12. What other effective features did you see?

13. What, if any, special classroom problems do you think are particular to or especially acute in this school?

14. If the instruction you have seen was typical of this school, how would you feel about having a child of your own enrolled?

    1. enthusiastic
    2. positive but with some reservations
    3. ambivalent
    4. negative but not completely
    5. completely negative

15. Assuming the pupil day in the average school costs $x, how much was the pupil day you saw worth?

    1. less than x
    2. x
    3. 2x

Additional Comments

OPEN ENROLLMENT

General School Report - End of First Visit

OE RECEIVING SCHOOL SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONNAIRE

16. How would you characterize the attitude of the administrative staff towards the OE program in their school?

    1. completely positive
    2. positive but with some reservations
    3. ambivalent
    4. negative but not completely
    5. completely negative

17. How would you characterize the attitude of the teaching staff towards the OE program in their school?

    1. completely positive
    2. positive but with some reservations
    3. ambivalent
    4. negative but not completely
    5. completely negative

18. What, if any, problems do you believe the OE program is responsible for in this school?

19. What, if any, advantages do you believe the OE program is responsible for in this school?

20. What, if any, problems do you attribute to the fact that some children are bussed into this school?

21. If the instruction you have seen was typical of all OE schools, how would you feel about having a child of your own enrolled in an OE school? -- if you were a parent of a resident child?

    1. enthusiastic
    2. positive but with some reservations
    3. ambivalent
    4. negative but not completely
    5. completely negative

22. If the instruction you have seen was typical of all OE schools, how would you feel about having a child of your own enrolled in an OE school? -- if you were a parent of an OE child?

    1. enthusiastic
    2. positive but with some reservations
    3. ambivalent
    4. negative but not completely
    5. completely negative

23. If these classes were typical of the quality of instruction in all OE schools how would you feel about the OE program in general?

    1. retain as is
    2. slightly change
    3. strongly modify
    4. abolish

24. Please give further explanation of your above answer

25. Assuming the pupil day in the average school costs $X, how much was the pupil day you saw worth?

    1. less than X
    2. X
    3. 2X

LUNCH PERIOD

1. Where are the students' eating facilities?
   1. separate lunch room
   2. classroom
   3. auditorium
   4. other (specify) ____________________

2. How would you describe the physical appearance of the dining area?
   1. extremely attractive
   2. more attractive than the average
   3. average
   4. less attractive than the average
   5. very unattractive

3. How would you describe the physical accommodations of the dining area?
   1. more than adequate
   2. adequate
   3. crowded

4. How would you rate discipline in the dining area?
   1. overly controlled
   2. well controlled
   3. poorly controlled
   4. no control

5. How would you describe the atmosphere in the dining area?
   1. relaxed and congenial
   2. strict yet congenial
   3. overstrict and cold
   4. chaotic

6. What percentage of the receiving children eat lunch in school?
   1. 75 - 100%
   2. 50 - 74%
   3. 25 - 49%
   4. 0 - 24%

7. Are the pupils assigned specific seats in the dining area?

   Yes No

   (If yes) To what extent is the seating of OE and receiving children mixed?

8. How would you describe the interaction among the OE and receiving pupils?
   1. extremely positive
   2. positive
   3. average
   4. negative
   5. extremely negative
   6. no possibilities for interaction; since no resident pupils

   (If you answered 4 or 5) Why?

B21

Center for Urban Education

Open Enrollment Program

General Classroom Report - Receiving Schools

School____________Borough__________Class________Grade___________Date____________

Teacher's Name____________________Sex______Observer__________________________

Length of observation______________Lessons observed in this class: ______________

If this is a joint observation, check here____and record name of other observer ______________________________. Joint observations should be reported by each observer without consultation.

1. What was the size of the class?________

2. How many OE pupils were in the class? ______ (Please ask teacher.)

3. How would you rate the attractiveness of the classroom?

   1. Very attractive
   2. More attractive than usual
   3. Of average attractiveness
   4. Less than averagely attractive
   5. Unattractive

4. How would you describe the classroom atmosphere in terms of discipline and in terms of warmth?

   1. Undisciplined and warm
   2. Undisciplined and cold
   3. Disciplined yet congenial or warm
   4. Disciplined and cold
   5. Overdisciplined yet warm
   6. Overdisciplined and cold

5. How would you describe the overall integration of OE children into the activities you observed?

   1. Extremely well integrated
   2. Well integrated
   3. Average
   4. Poorly integrated
   5. Little or no integration
   8. I could not distinguish OE children

6. How would you describe the overall inter-relationships among the children?

   1. Extremely positive
   2. Positive
   3. Average
   4. Negative
   5. Extremely Negative

B22

Center for Urban Education

Open Enrollment Program

General Classroom Report - Sending Schools

School ___________ Borough ________ Class _________ Grade _______ Date______

Teacher's name ____________________ Sex _____ Observer ____________________

Length of observation _____________ Lessons observed in this class: _________

If this is a joint observation, check here ____ and record name of other observer ________________________. Joint observations should be reported by each observer without consultation. (Note to observer: The question numbers correspond to another questionnaire and are not necessarily consecutive.)

1. What was the size of the class? _________

3. How would you rate the attractiveness of the classroom?

   1. Very attractive
   2. More attractive than usual
   3. Of average attractiveness
   4. Less than averagely attractive
   5. Unattractive

4. How would you describe the classroom atmosphere in terms of discipline and in terms of warmth?

   1. Undisciplined and warm
   2. Undisciplined and cold
   3. Disciplined yet congenial or warm
   4. Disciplined and cold
   5. Overdisciplined yet warm
   6. Overdisciplined and cold

6. How would you describe the overall inter-relationships among the children?

   1. Extremely positive
   2. Positive
   3. Average
   4. Negative
   5. Extremely Negative

B23

Open Enrollment Program

PRINCIPAL'S INTERVIEW - RECEIVING SCHOOL

As you know, we are studying the Open Enrollment Program. We would like to ask you a few questions relating to your perceptions of that program. Your answers will be held in strict confidence. Only the project director and his immediate staff will see any record of this interview. Neither you nor your school will ever be identified in any way in our reports.

School____________________Borough___________Date_________Interviewer_____________

Principal's Name:____

(Interviewer fill in) Approx. Age:_____M_____F_____N_____PR_____WH______

(Note to observers: The numbering which follows corresponds to another questionnaire and is not necessarily consecutive.)

3. What year was this school first designated a receiving school? ____________

5. How did you feel about the OE program when it began? (circle number)

   1. Enthusiastic
   2. Positive, but not enthusiastic
   3. Slightly positive
   4. Slightly negative
   5. Strongly negative

   Why?

6. How do you feel about the program now? (circle number)

   1. Enthusiastic
   2. Positive, but not enthusiastic
   3. Slightly positive
   4. Slightly negative
   5. Strongly negative

   Why? (Note to observers: If opinion changed, be sure to elicit reasons why).

7. Were space additions, changes or adjustments made to accommodate the program?

   1. Yes
   2. No

8. If yes, what? When?

9. Do the teachers and staff discuss the OE program with you?

   1. Yes
   2. No

10. If yes: 1) Frequently 2) Infrequently
    a) at conferences
    b) staff meetings
    c) private conversations
    d) other

11. What is your impression of their reaction to the OE program?

	a. All	b. Most	c. Half	d. Few	e. None
1. Enthusiastic					
2. Positive, but not enthusiastic					
3. Slightly positive					
4. Slightly negative					
5. Strongly negative					

Why?

12. Have steps been taken to increase the understanding and effectiveness of teachers involved in the program? (e.g., in-service training or workshops, etc.)

    1. Yes
    2. No
    8. Don't know

    If yes, what? When?

13. How many staff members participate?

    1. All
    2. Most
    3. Half
    4. Few

14. How effective do you think these methods are? (circle number)

    1. Extremely effective
    2. Moderately effective
    3. Slightly effective
    4. Not effective

    Why?

16. Have there been changes in the rate of application for transfers, resignations, or retirement by staff members since the beginning of the program?

    1. Substantial increase
    2. Moderate increase
    3. No change
    4. Moderate decrease
    5. Substantial decrease
    8. Don't know

17. If changes have occurred, how many of these changes can be attributed directly to the program?

    1. All
    2. Most
    3. Half
    4. Few
    5. None
    8. Don't know

    Why?

18. Do you have any suggestions, if staff attrition does result from the program, for encouraging teachers to remain or attracting new recruits?

19. Have the parents discussed the OE Program with you?

    1. Yes, frequently
    2. Yes, infrequently
    3. No

20. What is your perception of their reaction to the OE program?

	a. All	b. Most	c. Half	d. Few	e. None
1. Enthusiastic					
2. Positive, but not enthusiastic					
3. Slightly positive					
4. Slightly negative					
5. Strongly negative					

    Why?

21. Were steps taken to increase the understanding and cooperation of resident parents?

    1. Yes
    2. No
    8. Don't know

    If yes, what? When?

22. (If yes) what degree of success do you feel was achieved with these efforts?

    1. Great success in increasing understanding and cooperation
    2. Moderate success
    3. Little success
    4. Unsuccessful
    8. Don't know

23. Do the OE parents discuss the program with you?

    1. Yes, frequently
    2. Yes, infrequently
    3. No

24. What is your perception of their reaction to the OE program?

	a. All	b. Most	c. Half	d. Few	e. None
1. Enthusiastic					
2. Positive, but not enthusiastic					
3. Slightly positive					
4. Slightly negative					
5. Strongly negative					

Why?

25. What has been the reaction of the student body to the OE program and in particular what is their reaction to those students who transfer?
(Check ______ if don't know)

26. Were any steps taken to increase the resident pupil's understanding of the program?

    1. Yes
    2. No
    8. Don't know

If yes, what? When?

27. (If yes) what degree of success do you feel was achieved in increasing understanding with these efforts?

1 Great success
2. Moderate success
3. Little success
4. Unsuccessful
8. Don't know

28. From your contacts and conversations with parents who transfer their children, what seem to be the most prevalent reasons for applying to the OE program? (Note to observer: Try to elicit at least three reasons.)
(Check_______if don't know)

29. Do you feel that the children who enter the OE program are a typical representation of the student body in the sending school?

1. Yes
2. No
8. Don't know

30. If no, what type of children do you feel are

a. Over-represented____

____

b. Under-represented____

____

____

31. Have any of the OE parents withdrawn their children and returned them to the sending school?

1. Yes
2. No
8. Don't know

(If yes, answer question 33-36)

32. Approximately how many children return each year? ________________

33. What reasons are given for withdrawal from the program?
(Check here_______if don't know)

36. Do there seem to be certain kinds or types of children who drop out?

1. Yes
2. No
8. Don't know

(If yes, what?)

37. Considering these drop-outs, in general, how many years do they stay in the OE program before dropping out?________________________________

Now let's consider other aspects of the OE program's impact on your school.

38. Since the inception of the OE program, have there been changes in the attitude and behavior of the resident children?

1. Yes
2. No
8. Don't know

39. (If yes) were these changes (Check one in each column)

1. Positive
2. Negative

1) Substantially
2) Moderately
3) Slightly

40. How many of these changes do you attribute to the program?

1. All
2. Most
3. Half
4. Few
5. None
8. Don't know

41. (If 2-5 above) what other factors account for these changes?

42. Since the inception of the program have there been changes in the levels of achievement of the resident children?

1. Yes
2. No
8. Don't know

43. (If yes) were these changes (check one in each column)

1. Higher
2. Lower

1) Substantially
2) Moderately
3) Slightly

44. How many of these changes do you attribute to the program?
    1. All
    2. Most
    3. Half
    4. Few
    5. None
    8. Don't know

45. (If 2-5 above) what other factors account for these changes?

46. In your experience is there generally a change in the personal social adjustment of OE children after they enter the receiving school?
    1. Yes
    2. No
    8. Don't know

47. If yes, are these changes (Circle one in each column)

1. Higher	1) Substantially
	2) Moderately
2. Lower	3) Slightly

To what do you attribute these changes?

48. In your experience is there a relationship between the OE child's social adjustment and the grade he enters the OE program?
    1. Yes
    2. No
    8. Don't know

    If yes, what?

49. In your experience is there a change in the levels of achievement of OE children after they enter the receiving school?
    1. Yes
    2. No
    8. Don't know

50. If yes, are they (Circle one in each column)

1. Higher	1) Substantially
	2) Moderately
2. Lower	3) Slightly

To what do you attribute these changes?

51. Is there a relationship between the OE child's level of achievement in the receiving school and the grade he entered the OE program?

    1. Yes
    2. No
    8. Don't know

    If yes, what?

52. Do you feel there is a relationship between the OE child's level of achievement when he enters the OE program and his later academic progress?

    1. Yes
    2. No
    8. Don't know

    If yes, please explain

53. Consider your perception of the ideal OE program.

    a. What children would you admit to the program in terms of behavior and achievement?

    b. At which grade levels would you admit these students to the program?

54. Considering the OE program as it has been organized and administered this year, what in your opinion are the major weaknesses of the program?

55. In the same vein, what do you think are the most valuable contributions of the OE program?

56. Do you have any suggestions for improving the program?

57. Do you think the program should be: (circle number)

1. Continued as is
2. Continued with modifications
3. Expanded
4. Expanded with modifications
5. Abolished
6. Undecided

Why?

58. Do you wish to make any additional comments or mention some aspects we may have neglected?

(Note to observer: Please make additional comments you may have about this interview on the back of the page.)

B32

Center for Urban Education

Open Enrollment Program

PRINCIPAL'S INTERVIEW - SENDING SCHOOL

As you know, we are studying the Open Enrollment Program. We would like to ask you a few questions relating to your perceptions of that program. Your answers will be held in strict confidence. Only the project director and his immediate staff will see any record of this interview. Neither you nor your school will ever be identified in any way in our reports.

School ______________ Borough _______ Date _______ Interviewer ____________

Principal's Name: ____

(Interviewer fill in) Approx. Age: ____ M____ F____ N____ PR____ WH____

(Note to observers: The numbering which follows corresponds to another questionnaire and is not necessarily consecutive.)

1. How long have you been principal at this school? _________

2. What did you do before becoming principal here? ____________________

   At what school? ______________ Where? ____________________

   For how long? ______________

3. What year was this school first designated a sending school? ______________

4. Has the OE program affected your school? 1) Yes 2) No

   If yes, how? To what extent?

5. How did you feel about the OE program when it began? (circle number)

   1. Enthusiastic
   2. Positive, but not enthusiastic
   3. Slightly positive
   4. Slightly negative
   5. Strongly negative

   Why?

6. How do you feel about the Program now? (circle number)

   1. Enthusiastic
   2. Positive, but not enthusiastic
   3. Slightly positive
   4. Slightly negative
   5. Strongly negative

   Why? (Note to observers: If opinion changed, be sure to elicit reasons why?)

9. Do the teachers and staff discuss the OE program with you? 1. Yes 2. No

10. If yes: 1) Frequently 2) Infrequently

    a) At conferences b) Staff meetings
    c) Private conversations d) Others

11. What is your impression of their reaction to the OE program?

	a. All	b. Most	c. Half	d. Few	e. None
1. Enthusiastic					
2. Positive, but not enthusiastic					
3. Slightly positive					
4. Slightly negative					
5. Strongly negative					

Why?

16. Have there been changes in the rate of application for transfers, resignations or retirement by staff members since the beginning of the program?

    1. Substantial increase
    2. Moderate increase
    3. No change
    4. Moderate decrease
    5. Substantial decrease
    8. Don't know

17. If changes have occurred, how many of these changes can be attributed directly to the Program?

    1. All
    2. Most
    3. Half
    4. Few
    5. None
    8. Don't know

    Why?

18. Do you have any suggestions, if staff attrition does result from the program, for encouraging teachers to remain or attracting new recruits?

19. Have the parents discussed the OE program with you?

1. Yes, frequently
2. Yes, infrequently
3. No

21. What is your perception of their reaction to the OE program?

	a. All	b. Most	c. Half	d. Few	e. None
1. Enthusiastic					
2. Positive, but not enthusiastic					
3. Slightly positive					
4. Slightly negative					
5. Strongly negative					

Why?

22. Were steps taken to increase the understanding and cooperation of parents?

1. Yes
2. No
8. Don't know

If yes, what? When?

23. (If yes) what degree of success do you feel was achieved with these efforts?

1. Great success in increasing understanding and cooperation
2. Moderate success
3. Little success
4. Unsuccessful
8. Don't know

26. What has been the reaction of the student body to the OE program and in Particular what is their reaction to those students who transfer?
(Check____ if don't know)

27. Were any steps taken to increase the pupil's understanding of the program?

1. Yes
2. No
8. Don't know

If yes, what? When?

28. (If yes) what degree of success do you feel was achieved in increasing under- with these efforts?

1. Great success
2. Moderate success
3. Little success
4. Unsuccessful
8. Don't know

29. From your contacts and conversations with parents who transfer their children, what seem to be the most prevalent reasons for applying to the OE program? (Note to observer: Try to elicit at least three reasons.)
(Check____ if don't know)

30. Do you feel that the children who enter the OE Program are a typical reprentation of the student body in the sending school?

1. Yes
2. No
8. Don't know

31. If no, what type of children do you feel are

a. Over-represented____

____

b. Under-represented____

____

32. Have any of the OE parents withdrawn their children and returned them to the sending school?

1. Yes
2. No
8. Don't know

(If yes, answer questions 33-38)

33. Approximately how many children return each year? ________

34. What reasons are given for withdrawal from the program?
(Check here____if don't know)

35. Do there seem to be certain kinds or types of children who drop out?

1. Yes
2. No
8. Don't know

(If yes, what?)

36. Considering these drop-outs, in general, how many years do they stay in the OE program before dropping out? ____________

37. What effect does the OE experience seem to have on the achievement level of returning students? (Check____if don't know)

38. What effect does the OE experience seem to have on the attitude of returning students?
(Check____if don't know)

Now let's consider other aspects of the OE program's impact on your school.

39. Since the inception of the OE program, have there been changes in the attitude and behavior of the children who remain?

1. Yes
2. No
8. Don't know

40. (If yes) were these changes (Check one in each column)

1. Positive	1)Substantially
	2)Moderately
2. Negative	3)Slightly

41. How many of these changes do you attribute to the program?

1. All
2. Most
3. Half
4. Few
5. None
8. Don't know

42. (If 2-5 above) what other factors account for these changes?

43. Since the inception of the program have there been changes in the levels of achievement of the children who remain?

1. Yes
2. No
8. Don't know

44. (If yes) were these changes (Check one in each column.)

1. Higher	1) Substantially
	2) Moderately
2. Lower	3) Slightly

45. How many of these changes do you attribute to the program?

1. All
2. Most
3. Half
4. Few
5. None
8. Don't know

46. (If 2-5 above) what other factors account for these changes?

49. In your experience is there a relationship between the OE child's social adjustment and the grade he enters the OE program?

1. Yes
2. No
8. Don't Know

If yes, what?

52. Is there a relationship between the OE child's level of achievement in the receiving school and the grade he entered the OE program?

1. Yes
2. No
8. Don't know

If Yes, what?

53. Do you feel there is a relationship between the OE child's level of achievement when he enters the OE program and his later academic progress?

1. Yes
2. No
8. Don't know

If yes, please explain.

54. Consider your perception of the ideal OE program.

a. What children would you admit to the program in terms of behavior and achievement?

b. At which grade levels would you admit these students to the program?

55. Considering the OE program as it has been organized and administered this year, what in your opinion are the major weaknesses of the program?

56. In the same vein, what do you think are the most valuable contributions of the OE program?

57. Do you have any suggestions for improving the program?

58. Do you think the program should be: (circle number)

1. Continued as is
2. Continued with modifications
3. Expanded
4. Expanded with modifications
5. Abolished
6. Undecided

Why?

59. Do you wish to make any additional comments or mention some aspects we may have neglected?

(Note to observer: Please make any additional comments you may have about this interview on the back of the page.)

APPENDIX C

Staff List

Dr. David J. Fox, Evaluation Chairman
Associate Professor
Director, Educational Research and Evaluation Services
Chairman, Department of Social and Psychological Foundations
School of Education
College of the City of New York

Dr. Willard G. Adams
Associate Professor
Department of Secondary Education
School of Education
College of the City of New York

Dr. Augustine Brezina
Assistant Professor
Department of Secondary Education
School of Education
College of the City of New York

Debora Brink
Lecturer
Department of Social and Psychological Foundations
School of Education
College of the City of New York

Dr. Dorothy Cohen
Senior Faculty
Graduate Programs
Bank St. College of Education

Dr. Harold Davis
Assistant Professor
Department of School Services
School of Education
College of the City of New York

Mr. Richard G. Durnin
Lecturer
Department of Social and Psychological Foundations
School of Education
College of the City of New York

Mrs. Sophie L. Elam
Assistant Professor
Department of Social and Psychological Foundations
School of Education
College of the City of New York

Mrs. Lorraine S. Flaum
Evaluation Coordinator

Dr. William M. Greenstadt
Assistant Professor
Department of School Services
School of Education
College of the City of New York

Dr. Ruth Grossman
Assistant Professor
Department of Elementary Education
School of Education
College of the City of New York

Dr. George Hammer
Assistant Professor
Department of Secondary Education
School of Education
College of the City of New York

Mr. Frederick Hill, Jr.
Doctoral Candidate
Ferkauf Graduate School of Education
Yeshiva University

Dr. Lisa Kuhmerker
Assistant Professor
Department of Education
Hunter College

Miss Jean Fair Mitchell
Headmistress
The Brearley School

Dr. Julius Rosen
Assistant Professor
Department of School Services
School of Education
College of the City of New York

Dr. Sol Schwartz
Assistant Professor
Department of Social and
Psychological Foundations
School of Education
College of the City of New York

Mrs. Peggy M. Schwarz
Instructor
Department of Elementary Education
School of Education
College of the City of New York

Dr. James J. Shields, Jr.
Assistant Professor
Department of Social and
Psychological Foundations
School of Education
College of the City of New York

Dr. Marvin Siegelman
Associate Professor
Department of Social and
Psychological Foundations
School of Education
College of the City of New York

Dr. Madelon D. Stent
Assistant Professor
Department of Elementary Education
School of Education
College of the City of New York

Mr. James W. Stern
Headmaster
Columbia Grammar School

Mrs. Emmeline Weinberg
Lecturer
Department of Elementary Education
School of Education
College of the City of New York

Dr. Theresa A. Woodruff
Associate Professor
Department of Elementary Education
School of Education
College of the City of New York